An Evaluation of the Indiana State Library's Implementation Of the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) 1997 – 2002

Prepared for

The Indiana State Library

By

Himmel & Wilson
Library Consultants

December 20, 2001
Milton, Wisconsin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The legislation establishing the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) program requires that each state evaluate activities carried out under their LSTA Plan before the authorization for the program expires in 2002. The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the Federal agency responsible for the LSTA program, required each state library agency to submit a comprehensive evaluation of its progress toward meeting the goals and objectives outlined in its long-range plan no later than April 2002.

In September of 2000, following a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process, the Indiana State Library (ISL) retained the services of Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants to assist the state library agency and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council (ISLAC) in evaluating Indiana's implementation of the LSTA program.

On December 8, 2000, the consultants met with the State Library's Library Development Office staff to begin the process of determining the exact methodology to be used in carrying out the evaluation. The consultants and staff reviewed the stated goals of the ***Indiana Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan for 1997-2002***, discussed the activities and strategies that have been used to carry out the Plan, and discussed the techniques that could be used to ensure that a broadly representative sample of the Indiana library community would have an opportunity to participate in the evaluation process.

The evaluation process that was subsequently implemented included the following components:

- The consultants interviewed ISL staff, reviewed grant documentation such as grant application, correspondence, and reports on grant activities.

- Focus group discussions were held in locations in each of Indiana's ten Congressional Districts. A total of 82 members of the Indiana library community participated in these sessions.

- Thirty-five people including grant recipients and representatives of the leadership of the Indiana library community were individually interviewed.

- A web survey exploring issues raised in focus groups and interviews was posted on the consultants' web site. The Indiana State Library advertised the availability of the web survey through listservs and by placing a link to the survey from the ISL Development Office's web page. One hundred and twenty individuals responded to the survey.

Following is a summary of the consultants' findings and recommendations, which are based on the evaluation that was conducted:

Finding A
The LSTA program has had a significant impact on the improvement of library and information services in Indiana since 1997.

> **Recommendation A.1.**
> **The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should work with the library community and its INSPIRE project partners to develop a highly targeted end-user training program that can be used by libraries throughout the State to increase the use of INSPIRE and other electronic resources.**

> **Recommendation A.2.**
> **The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should work with the library community and its INSPIRE project partners to develop a highly targeted public awareness campaign that can be used by libraries throughout the State to increase the visibility of libraries and their resources.**

Recommendation A.3.
LSTA funding should be used to conduct an assessment of collections and/or resources that are candidates for digitization with the intent of making the most significant collections available to Indiana residents.

Recommendation A.4.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should work with the library community to develop a comprehensive resource sharing plan that clarifies the roles and responsibilities of all types of libraries, the technological mechanisms to be used to make library holdings information available to the public, and the means by which information resources, both in physical and electronic formats, will be delivered to the public.

Finding B
The Indiana State Library has made less notable progress on goals related to service to special needs populations and to education and training than it has made in goal areas directly related to improving the availability and effective use of information technologies and digital resources in Indiana's libraries.

Recommendation B.1.
The Indiana State Library should work with the state's various "disabilities communities" and with the Indiana State Legislature to determine ways to shift some of the operational costs of the LBPH program to State funding while using LSTA funds to enhance library and information services to individuals with disabilities and to other special needs populations.

Recommendation B.2.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should explore ways to use LSTA funds to encourage the long-term development of quality library services in State institutions.

Recommendation B.3.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should consider the development of an LSTA-funded initiative aimed at the improvement of local library services to persons with disabilities.

Recommendation B.4.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should consider an initiative that would enable local literacy organizations to participate in the Literacy Accountability System in partnership with their local public library.

Recommendation B.5.
The Indiana State Library should continue its practice of working with INCOLSA to ensure the availability of quality staff development offerings on specific topics.

Recommendation B.6.
The Indiana State Library should continue to invest LSTA resources in the Distance Learning initiative. In particular, efforts should stress:
1. **improving the reliability of the system,**
2. **increasing the availability of content, and,**
3. **fostering cooperation with educational and non-profit partners in distance learning.**

Recommendation B.7.
The Indiana State Library needs to review its current use of LSTA funding for Reference/Data Center positions with an eye toward expanding the relevance of these efforts to the LSTA goals and awareness of these efforts in the library community.

Recommendation B.8.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should closely examine the LSTA budget to determine whether it is feasible to allocate a larger amount of money to the "Innovative" grant category.

Recommendation B.9.
**Regardless of whether or not additional funds
are allocated to the "Innovative" grant category,
maximum award levels for individual libraries
should be increased to at least $ 20,000.**

Finding C:
**The Indiana State Library has administered the LSTA
program well.**

Recommendation C.1.
**The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State
Library Advisory Council should review current
evaluation and reporting requirements and
should attempt to streamline the process
especially as they relate to grants less than
$ 20,000.**

Recommendation C.2.
**In working to streamline the evaluation and
reporting process, the Indiana State Library and
the Indiana State Library Advisory Council
should examine ways to make the evaluation
process more valuable both to the libraries doing
the evaluation and to the rest of the library
community.**

Recommendation C.3.
**The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State
Library Advisory Council should consider the
development of an outcome-based assessment
program or the adaptation of an existing model
to make grant evaluation more relevant and
useful.**

Recommendation C.4.
**The Indiana State Library should explore with
the State Board of Accounts to determine the
feasibility of some sort of advanced payment
process in relation to at least small LSTA grant
awards.**

Recommendation C.5.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should allocate LSTA resources to fund an institute or a series of workshops on the topic of building successful partnerships.

Finding D:
The process used to award LSTA grants has resulted in the broad geographic distribution of grant awards.

Recommendation D.1.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should explore the question of why large public libraries apply for relatively few LSTA grants and should consider strategies that would encourage a higher level of participation by these libraries.

II.   INTRODUCTION

In September of 2000, following a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process, the Indiana State Library (ISL) retained the services of Himmel & Wilson, Library Consultants to assist the state library agency and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council (ISLAC) in evaluating Indiana's implementation of the Library Services and Technology Act program. The consultants first worked with the State Library's Library Development Office staff to develop an evaluation plan, which was subsequently submitted to and accepted by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS).

The consultants then carried out an evaluation of the ***Indiana Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan for 1997-2002*** using the methodologies and assessment strategies outlined in the evaluation plan. Following is the evaluation plan as submitted to IMLS.

Goals of the Current Plan

Plan for the Evaluation of Indiana's LSTA Funds

Indiana's Library Services and Technology Act Plan was prepared following an analysis of library and information service needs of the state's residents. Pertinent information was gathered from the U.S. Census, *The Indiana Poll*, Indiana State Library surveys, focus groups, state agency reports, and other national and state surveys. Based on this information ISLAC recommended that technology be a priority for the use of LSTA funds in assisting libraries in linking to the Internet, in developing community or regional databases, in enabling access to long-distance education technologies, and in increasing the technological capacities of libraries. Following revisions based on written comments and focus group sessions, the Plan was adopted by the Indiana Library & Historical Board on June 13, 1997. A number of minor revisions were recommended by ISLAC in January of 1999 and the Indiana Library & Historical Board approved the revised LSTA plan for 1999-2002 in March of 1999.

Goals of the 1997-2002 plan:

Goal 1:
Increase public use of information technology by increasing electronic capabilities of libraries, promoting technology at libraries, and training librarians and the public to effectively use technology.

This goal is in response to the status of information technology in Indiana libraries. A 1997 State Library survey reported 30% of Indiana's public libraries lacked an Internet connection, 27% lacked microcomputers for public use, and 20% lacked microcomputers for staff use. Fifty-three percent (53%) were without an automated circulation control system. INSPIRE (Indiana Spectrum of Information Resources) was conceived as a "virtual" electronic library available for anyone in Indiana with Internet access, providing users statewide with access (beginning in 1998) to free and commercial databases. In order to respond to public needs for access to electronic information resources, libraries require a range of switched broadband, high-speed, interactive telecommunications services both on site and at remote locations. These services must allow for efficient and timely delivery of multimedia services for distance learning. Focus group participants raised a number of issues related to training opportunities for librarians and for librarians to establish training programs for the public. The following activities were chosen as a focus under this goal: technology grants, INSPIRE, training programs, digitization, content development, and promotion of information services.

Goal 2:
Improve library service to the residents of Indiana by assisting libraries in making their resources known statewide.

The expense of retrospective conversion has kept many small public libraries from sharing their resources outside their community via automated circulation systems; the expense of making library catalogs web accessible has kept many medium to large size libraries from sharing their resources via the Internet. INCOLSA (The Indiana Cooperative Library Services Authority) concentrates on modernizing library operations through cooperative automation and application of new technology as well as

providing Indiana libraries with access to a national bibliographic network. Activities such as cooperative contracting, purchase of technology, and technology monitoring carried out by INCOLSA would facilitate access to information resources for all library users. The following activities were chosen as a focus under this goal: retrospective conversion, web access to library catalogs, cooperative services, and resource sharing.

Goal 3:
Meet the library and information needs of special populations in Indiana by enabling public libraries to improve service to those populations.

Indiana librarians need to be able to identify the special populations in Indiana and to identify the best ways to deliver information services to people in these disadvantaged groups. A number of agencies, the State Library, INCOLSA, and the State Data Center for example, can assist librarians in identifying populations with special needs and in developing programs and services for individuals with special needs. The following activities were chosen as a focus under this goal: services to special populations, including institutionalized residents, and support of the blind and physically handicapped reading services from the Indiana State Library.

Goal 4:
Serve individuals with literacy or learning needs by enabling libraries to improve service to those individuals.

Various sources estimate the percents of individuals in Indiana who lack basic reading, writing, and computing skills. (We are limited to using estimates in this area because individuals with these needs are often invisible; they are unable to use traditional learning methods and choose not to point out their own difficulties.) Technology-based media that use sound, video, graphics, and text that are easily adaptable to individual needs offer good opportunities as successful teaching aids. Many people in state institutions have a great need for help with literacy. Distance learning sites are also needed in Indiana because colleges and universities are not readily available to every community. Libraries are promising sites for distance learning facilities and library staff and trustees are likely

users of distance learning programs. The following
activities were chosen as a focus under this goal:
consulting services from the State Library, continuing
education, literacy initiatives, and distance learning.

Goal 5:
Enable libraries to support innovative projects.

Funding for libraries does not usually include "venture
capital" or "seed money" for innovative projects. This goal
is directed toward supporting innovative projects that fit
under one (or more) of Goals 1-4.

What Will be Evaluated?

The evaluation will look at the overall picture of the
administration and process of LSTA grantmaking in
Indiana for the years FY 1998, FY 1999, and FY 2000.
The consultants will analyze the allocation of funds from
various perspectives, i.e., type of library, geographic areas
impacted, populations served, etc. as well as reviewing
grant reports for evidence of impact and effectiveness of
the grants in supporting the stated goals. Participants in
focus group discussions will be asked to evaluate the
effectiveness of the LSTA program in meeting the stated
goals and in improving the capacities of Indiana libraries to
serve their users. Participants will also be asked to discuss
how a modified or different use of LSTA funds might have
had a larger impact on their users.

Four grant programs will be evaluated in more detail.
Following is a brief description of each program and the
questions to be explored.

Library Technology Grants Project:
Years and amounts: 1998-$962,724; 1999-$1,350,000;
2000-$832,178 plus $117,614 in innovative grants.
Description: This grant project has focused on upgrading
technology at libraries in order to serve users'
informational needs in a quicker and more responsive way.
Emphasis has been placed on digital sources of information
and the benefits libraries and end users receive from access
to information in that format.

Questions: What have the grants allowed libraries to do
that they were unable to do prior to the grant funding?

What has the impact of the grants been on the public that uses the libraries? Is Indiana focusing on the right areas for technology grants? Have grants allowed libraries to advance more rapidly or are they just replacing local dollars? Are smaller grants as effective as larger ones? Is there measurable increased access to information (digital, shared catalogs, etc.) after 3 years of technology grants?

INSPIRE Virtual Library Grants:
Years and amounts: 1998-$565,000; 1999-$502,810; 2000-$568,148.
Description: INSPIRE provides all (5.8 million) residents of Indiana access to commercial databases, library catalogs, and other electronic resources from libraries and outside locations. The project has included a public awareness campaign.

Questions: Has there been enough training and has it been effective? How many people actually use INSPIRE after training? How have the INSPIRE promotional spots and materials impacted use of INSPIRE? Has publicity reached the intended audiences? How has INSPIRE impacted end users? Is it the first search engine they use, the second, or one of the last? What additional programs and services have librarians been able to provide because of savings incurred by the provision of free databases through a state grant and operational funds through LSTA? Has INSPIRE impacted smaller libraries more than larger libraries?

Distance Learning Grants:
Years and amounts: 1998-$90,000; 1999-$147,000; 2000-$201,067.
Description: The major focus of this grant program has been to develop and expand distance learning capabilities within Indiana in order to help train, educate, and serve Indiana libraries and their staffs. The program was intended to reduce travel time, increase the quality of the programs, and enhance the quality of the network for libraries.

Questions: How many participants have attended distance education programs? Are we reaching more people because of the programs? Are we able to do fewer workshops, but reach more people? Did participants save time and expenses by attending distance education programs rather than traditional programs? Are the distance education

programs and traditional programs equally effective? What
has the impact on local libraries been?

Literacy Grants:
Years and amounts: 1998 - 2000 - $71,000 per year.
Description: This project covers funds granted to the
Indiana literacy programs and to institutional literacy
programs. The funds are used to provide resources and
training for library staffs serving special populations and to
promote and initiate literacy programs related to
populations with limited information skills. The Special
Services Consultant oversees the allocation of these funds
and also works to develop relationships with other state
level organizations involved in such services. In 2000 a
special emphasis was placed on the use of technology for
upgrading literacy programs.

Questions: Has the addition of new books and technology
in the institutional libraries increased library usage? Has
the receipt of the grant money made a change in the lives of
the librarians or the offenders? What impact have the new
materials had on the literacy programs within the
institutions? How are literacy programs being promoted?

Who Will Participate in the Evaluation?

Participants in the evaluation process will include members
of the Indiana library community, State Library staff, and,
in the case of the four targeted grant programs, end users of
those grant programs. The primary mechanism for
participation will be through focus group discussions held
in each of Indiana's ten Congressional districts.

How Will the Evaluation be Conducted?

The consultants will begin by analyzing background
documents related to the administration of the program and
the grants approved under each of the five goals. With the
assistance of the State Library staff in identifying potential
participants and sites, the State Librarian will issue
invitations to specific individuals to participate in
individual focus group discussions related to grants made
under each of the goals. A few general focus group
sessions discussing grant programs under all five goals will
also be held. The four specific grant programs related to
Technology, INSPIRE, Distance Education, and Literacy

will receive more detailed scrutiny with the consultants
making site visits to the agencies having received those
grants in order to conduct individual interviews and focus
group discussions with users of the service or program
made possible by those grants. A draft final report of the
evaluation including findings and potential consultant
recommendations will be presented at a forum in
Indianapolis and/or posted on our web-site for further
comment and refinement before the final report is issued.

What We Did

On December 8, 2000, the consultants met with the State
Library's Library Development Office staff to begin the
process of determining the exact methodology to be used in
carrying out the evaluation. The consultants and staff
reviewed the stated goals of the ***Indiana Library Services
and Technology Act (LSTA) Plan for 1997-2002***,
discussed the activities and strategies that have been used
to carry out the Plan, and discussed the techniques that
could be used to ensure that a broadly representative
sample of the Indiana library community would have an
opportunity to participate in the evaluation process.

It was determined that geographically distributed focus
groups, personal interviews with a cross-section of the
Indiana library community and a web-based survey would
achieve a high level of inclusiveness.

On March 13 and 14, 2001, the consultants met with the
State Library's Library Development Office staff to
structure the data gathering process, identify focus group
participants and potential interview subjects and to discuss
key grants. The consultants also reviewed grant
documentation such as grant application, correspondence,
and reports on grant activities during this visit to the State
Library. On April 20th the consultants provided an
overview of the project at the regularly scheduled ISLAC
meeting. ISLAC members also participated in a discussion
of the LSTA goals and their perceptions of the degree to
which the goals had been attained.

During the week of April 23rd, focus group discussions
were held in locations in each of Indiana's ten
Congressional Districts. Sessions were held in Clarksville,
Evansville, Fort Wayne, Indianapolis, Kokomo,

Merrillville, New Castle, Rensselaer, South Bend, and Terre Haute. Eighty-two (82) members of the library community took part in these sessions. A summary of the focus group sessions is attached as Appendix A.

Participants in focus groups were asked their opinions concerning the impact of key LSTA grants and LSTA-funded initiatives, both statewide and at their own libraries, and whether those outcomes would have occurred without assistance from LSTA. Participants were asked whether the priorities for the LSTA program in Indiana were the right ones. In addition, they were given an opportunity to express their top priorities for the future. Focus group attendees were asked for their assessment of how the LSTA program is administered by the Indiana State Library and to share stories of the impact of programs supported by LSTA funds.

Thirty-five people representing the library community leadership in Indiana were also interviewed. Many of these individuals were interviewed in their own libraries during the week in which the focus groups were held. The remaining interviews were conducted by telephone in subsequent weeks.

Interviewees included the State Librarian, current and former members of advisory and governing committees for INSPIRE, ISLAC, and the Special Services Committee; directors of libraries that had received grants, and directors of the libraries hosting focus group discussions. A summary of the interviews is provided in Appendix B.

During the period between May 14 and June 1, 2001, a total of one-hundred and twenty (120) responses were received to a web survey posted on the consultants' web-site. The Indiana State Library advertised the availability of the web survey through listservs and by placing a link to the survey from the ISL Development Office's web page.

While the survey does not represent a scientifically valid sample because participants are self-selected rather than chosen at random, the web survey does capture the thoughts and opinions of representatives of the Indiana library community. Questions included on the survey were largely based on issues raised in the focus group sessions.

A summary of the web survey results along with a copy of the web survey instrument can be found in Appendix C.

The following document reports the results of the evaluation and offers recommendations for improving Indiana's implementation of the LSTA program. In addition, we believe that the report contains information that will be helpful to the State Library and to ISLAC as they go about developing the LSTA Plan for the next five-year period. It should be noted that while the body of the report provides a synthesis and analysis of the findings of the evaluation, the appendices offer the detail upon which the findings and recommendations are based. Therefore, a reading of the entire document, including the appendices, is highly recommended.

The consultants explored a variety of issues in the course of the evaluation ranging from the effectiveness of specific projects to the amount of LSTA funding devoted to statewide projects and support of the State Library's operations versus the amount allocated to competitive grants. Attention was also given to the ways in which State of Indiana and Federal funds have been used to complement each other. However, the focus of the study was to determine the extent to which LSTA funds enabled the State of Indiana to achieve the goals set forth in the 1997 - 2002 Library Services and Technology Act Plan. The primary question explored was simply, "Did the Indiana State Library accomplish what it set out to accomplish with the LSTA funds that have been provided to the State?"

III. FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

An Analysis of Progress by Goal Area

Finding A
The LSTA program has had a significant impact on the improvement of library and information services in Indiana since 1997.

The Library Services and Technology Act has been responsible for many positive changes in Indiana's libraries since 1997. One librarian offered the assessment that

"LSTA lifted us from the pit of the digital divide." Another said, "LSTA is the carrot that encourages us to think about possibilities."

Even more importantly, it appears that the LSTA program has made a positive difference in the lives of countless Indiana residents. Initiatives funded in part or in whole by LSTA have increased the access that Indiana residents have to quality information resources in their homes and in their workplaces as well as in their libraries.

The impact of programs funded with LSTA funds can be seen both at the local and statewide levels. However, greater progress has been made in regard to some goals and less progress has been made toward attaining others. ISLAC recommended that technology be the top priority for the use of LSTA funds. Our evaluation reveals that, in fact, the Indiana State Library followed through on that recommendation. LSTA funding has clearly enabled Indiana's libraries to experience the greatest advancement in recent years in areas directly related to information technologies.

This is not to say that there have not been achievements in other goal areas. It simply means that progress in areas other than technology have been at more moderate levels.

In the course of our evaluation of Indiana's LSTA program, we found broad support for the high priority that has been placed on information technology. The majority of those participating in focus groups, in individual interviews, and in the web survey voiced their strong support for the current priorities. However, there were a few detractors to this approach. The most pointed came from an individual who offered that her top priority for the future of the LSTA program would be, "…anything that *isn't* technology."

Nevertheless, the Indiana State Library has followed a path, strongly supported by a majority of their constituents, that has enhanced public access to quality information and has strengthened the position of local libraries as vital information agencies in their communities. The consultants believe that this is a notable accomplishment.

Following is an overview of the progress made in each of the goal areas:

PROGRESS ON GOAL 1:
**Increase public use of information technology by
increasing electronic capabilities of libraries, promoting
technology at libraries, and training librarians and the
public to effectively use technology.**

Indiana's implementation of LSTA has achieved its greatest
success by far in regard to Goal 1. The consultants'
evaluation discovered ample evidence that LSTA dollars
have been used very effectively. Funds have been used to
improve Indiana's information technology infrastructure, to
increase the number of electronic access points in libraries,
to facilitate the statewide distribution of digital information
resources, to develop new digital resources, to inform the
library community and the public of the availability of
digital/electronic resources, and to train library staff to use
the resources effectively.

The Indiana State Library has done a masterful job of
coordinating the use of LSTA funds with State funds for
related technology initiatives (such as funding for licensing
online databases) and with other Federal programs (such as
the "e-rate" program) to achieve maximum results. In a
few short years, Indiana has made exceptional progress in
moving libraries into the digital age.

Indiana has done a particularly good job of matching its
technology initiatives to the needs of individual libraries.
Libraries have been afforded access to programs aimed at
improving telecommunications connectivity, local and
wide-area networks, as well as assistance in establishing a
web presence. The Indiana State Library has *not* taken a
one-size-fits-all approach to its basic technology effort.
Libraries at a variety of stages of technological
development have received assistance at their own level of
need.

The result is that the State has built a solid technological
foundation. Furthermore, while continuing to support
relatively basic connectivity needs, Indiana has moved
quickly to make sure that the infrastructure being built is
used by providing all residents of the State with access to
high quality information content through the INSPIRE
project. Notable efforts have also been made to ensure that

librarians in the State of Indiana are competent in using these resources and that residents are aware that the resources are available. Some important progress has been made in digitizing historical records and documents and in making them available to the public as well. In short, the consultants conclude that Indiana has made outstanding progress toward achieving Goal 1.

Furthermore, we believe that the ISL's handling of the INSPIRE program (using both State and LSTA funds) is exemplary. Both State and LSTA funds have been used to support INSPIRE. The program includes significant training, public awareness, and technical support components. Indiana has gone far beyond the "build it and they will come" mentality that has been seen in some other states in relation to database licensing initiatives. In many ways, INSPIRE offers an excellent model of how to do things right!

Is there still room for improvement? Certainly. As was alluded to above, two of the INSPIRE project components that have received LSTA support are training and public awareness. Training to date has been targeted toward librarians and other library staff. Public awareness efforts have targeted both the library community and the general public.

Training efforts directed toward library staff have been quite successful. The library community consistently praised technology training designed and delivered by INCOLSA using LSTA funding. It is also clear that public awareness efforts coordinated by the Indiana Library Federation (ILF) have ensured that the library community is fully aware of INSPIRE. While the general public's awareness of INSPIRE is still at a relatively low level, this is due more to the enormity of the challenge rather than to any failing of the publicity efforts to date.

It is obvious that staff training will be needed on an ongoing basis as will a campaign to keep the library community up to date on new developments such as enhanced resources, refined interfaces and improved functionality. However, the consultants believe that new training and public awareness efforts will be required if INSPIRE is to reach its full potential.

We believe that highly targeted end-user training and a coordinated public awareness campaign targeted toward the same audiences are desirable. It is our opinion that this approach will result in increased use of INSPIRE resources by the public as well as greater visibility for libraries. While the consultants believe that teachers and students are attractive candidates for these publicity and training efforts, decisions regarding targeted audiences should be made by the ISL and ISLAC in cooperation with members of the Indiana library community.

Recommendation A.1.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should work with the library community and its INSPIRE project partners to develop a highly targeted end-user training program that can be used by libraries throughout the State to increase the use of INSPIRE and other electronic resources.

Recommendation A.2.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should work with the library community and its INSPIRE project partners to develop a highly targeted public awareness campaign that can be used by libraries throughout the State to increase the visibility of libraries and their resources.

The consultants believe that "portability" should be an important consideration for both the public awareness and training efforts. For example, publicity materials, news releases, radio spots, etc. should lend themselves to the addition of local content and/or "taglines." Web-based and video training modules that can be used directly by end-users or in conjunction with the assistance of local trainers should be investigated.

LSTA funds have been used to fund a sizeable number of digitization projects undertaken by individual libraries in both the "technology grant" and "innovative grant" categories. While the majority of awards have gone to public libraries, academic institutions, schools, and the State Library itself have also received digitization grants.

Libraries have been encouraged to be innovative in their approaches to digitization. Not surprisingly, initial

digitization efforts have headed in many different directions. Very few limitations have been placed on what could be digitized. Public records (such as births, deaths, and marriages) have been digitized as well as local newspapers, historical documents and photographs. Technologies used to digitize records and the means of distributing the information have also varied significantly.

As the Indiana library community has gained more experience with digitization, the State Library has used this experience to further define and refine its digitization efforts. For example, grant applicants are now required to address the issue of making the digitized content web-accessible and print materials that are in jeopardy of being lost are given priority over those that are in relatively stable condition.

The consultants believe that Indiana's digitization program has now reached a stage of maturity that allows for an even more structured approach. We would suggest a two-pronged attack. First, LSTA funds should be used to conduct an assessment of candidates for digitization toward the end of establishing a list of digitization priorities. Standards for digitization methods and formats should also be developed. This first portion of the digitization effort should be aimed at making the most significant collections available to Indiana's residents.

Secondly, in order to maintain some room for experimentation and creativity, grant applications for digitization that do not fit the requirements described above should still be accepted under the innovative category.

Recommendation A.3.
LSTA funding should be used to conduct an assessment of collections and/or resources that are candidates for digitization with the intent of making the most significant collections available to Indiana residents.

PROGRESS ON GOAL 2:
Improve library service to the residents of Indiana by assisting libraries in making their resources known statewide.

LSTA dollars have also helped Indiana's libraries achieve outstanding success in pursuit of Goal 2. Again, State of Indiana funds and Federal dollars have been effectively used in concert, especially to support the development of an information technology infrastructure. Good progress has also been made in efforts to convert bibliographic records to machine-readable form, to automate library catalogs, and to make library holdings widely available on the World Wide Web.

LSTA supported technology assistance provided through INCOLSA has enabled many libraries to make progress toward automation that would have been impossible otherwise. Funds have been used to encourage libraries to pursue automation standards and to take steps to make their holdings web accessible.

While work remains to be done in relation to this goal, nevertheless, the average resident of Indiana has vastly improved access to the resources of Indiana's libraries compared to what was available in 1997-98. It should also be noted that the State Library's level of involvement with school libraries has increased markedly during the previous and current grant cycles in relation to this goal.

The consultants conclude that Indiana has made notable progress toward reaching Goal 2. We offer the words of one Indiana librarian as evidence of this fact. She said, "The public is beginning to see the library in a different way…LSTA has helped the library become recognized as a technology leader in the community."

The INSPIRE project has done much to foster cooperation between and among various types of libraries in Indiana. Additional cooperative efforts have been made under Goal 2 to create a seamless resource-sharing network in the State. For example, relatively small allocations of LSTA funds have been awarded to several universities in the State to ensure their full participation in interlibrary loan activities. As mentioned above, school libraries have received LSTA funding to assist them with retrospective conversion and automation projects. These efforts are laudable; however, there is some evidence that resource-sharing efforts have been somewhat piecemeal.

ISLAC has a Resource Sharing Committee that has been instrumental in providing valuable guidance to the State Library in relation to such matters. It is, however, simply a sub-committee of a body with far greater responsibilities. The consultants believe that LSTA dollars could be used even more effectively if a truly comprehensive plan for statewide resource-sharing, developed with broad input from all types of libraries, was in place. The need for a comprehensive plan becomes even more important as LSTA dollars begin to flow to the development of virtual reference service. Indiana needs a clear vision for a seamless resource-sharing network.

Recommendation A.4.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should work with the library community to develop a comprehensive resource sharing plan that clarifies the roles and responsibilities of all types of libraries, the technological mechanisms to be used to make library holdings information available to the public, and the means by which information resources, both in physical and electronic formats, will be delivered to the public.

Virtual reference, electronic document delivery and universal access to locally digitized resources should be addressed in such a plan along with a strategy to achieve statewide patron-initiated interlibrary loan and effective methods for the reimbursement of net-lenders. INSPIRE provides the basis for a true information portal for Indiana residents. However, for INSPIRE to become *the* entry point into the world of information for Indiana residents, the Indiana State Library may need to play a larger role in setting technological standards. While this is always a bit of a controversial role, the consultants found support from a surprising number of people for ISL's involvement in this regard.

Finding B
The Indiana State Library has made less notable progress on goals related to service to special needs populations and to education and training than it has made in goal areas directly related to improving the availability and effective use of information technologies and digital resources in Indiana's libraries.

PROGRESS ON GOAL 3:
**Meet the library and information needs of special
populations in Indiana by enabling public libraries to
improve service to those populations.**

The Indiana State Library has placed the greatest emphasis
on the maintenance and strengthening of a highly valued
ongoing service in its effort to accomplish Goal 3. The
lion's share of LSTA dollars expended in this goal area is
used to support the Indiana State Library Special Services
Division's Library for the Blind and Physically
Handicapped (LBPH) program and the LBPH services
offered through four subregional libraries.

LSTA funds are also used to support the Special Services
Coordinator position in the ISL's Library Development
Office. The work performed by this individual *has* had
some impact on literacy services to individuals in State
institutions and on local library services to special needs
populations; however, in both cases, progress appears to be
marginal. The resources allocated to these efforts simply
have not been sufficient to have a major impact.

This is no doubt due, in large part, to the fact that the
Special Services Coordinator is only one person with broad
responsibilities related to two separate goal areas. She has
been ISL's primary point of contact with literacy
organizations as well as with advocacy groups and agencies
providing support services to people with disabilities.

In spite of the fact that we believe that only marginal
progress toward attaining Goal 3 has been made,
nevertheless, it is our opinion that the work of the Special
Service Coordinator is vitally important. She has employed
a number of methods including workshops, newsletter
articles, and listservs to raise the awareness of the library
community on issues related to library service to adults and
children with special needs. The coordinator has also
developed a good working relationship with library staff in
State institutions. She was involved in selecting and
deploying 79 workstations equipped with assistive
technologies that were purchased with remaining LS**C**A
Title II funds and were placed in 60 libraries. We reiterate,
we believe that relatively minor progress has been made on

Goal 3 because a relatively small amount of resources has been allotted to the effort.

The LBPH program is worthy of support. It is highly valued by its users and reaches populations that would otherwise be unserved or underserved. However, the magnitude of the dollars designated to support this ongoing service has hindered the Indiana State Library's efforts to help public libraries improve their services to special needs populations. It has also limited the degree to which significant progress can be made in providing library and information services to institutionalized populations. Much work needs to be done both in public libraries and in institutions.

In the opinion of the consultants, the Indiana State Library has used the dollars it has invested in pursuit of Goal 3 responsibly. The only problem is that Goal 3 places considerable emphasis on enabling public libraries to improve their services to special populations. Unfortunately, this aspect of Goal 3 has not received adequate attention.

Members of the Indiana library community mentioned the library service needs of a number of special needs populations in the course of the data-gathering phase of the evaluation project. People with disabilities who are not qualified for NLS services or who want service other than the talking book and Braille services provided through LBPH, "children-at-risk," and Indiana's growing Hispanic population were specifically cited as potential target audiences for improved local library service.

The Indiana State Library is directing LSTA funds toward an area of great need. LBPH services are essential to thousands of Indiana residents. Over half a million items are circulated by the more than 11,000 Indiana residents who are registered for the program. We are not at all belittling the importance of LBPH.

However, the residents of State institutions in Indiana are also in need of quality library services. Evidence reviewed by the consultants in the course of our evaluation revealed that the library services and resources available to individuals residing in most institutions are minimal. Clearly, the small grants given to State institutions are

reaching an underserved audience that has very special needs. Undoubtedly, individual lives are being touched by the literacy grants to institutions. Nevertheless, what is being done is clearly too little given the magnitude of the need.

The question then, which can be raised in regard to Goal 3, is not whether current expenditures on LBPH are justifiable; the question is "What else needs to be done to improve library and information services to people with special needs?" The simple answer is, "A great deal."

It can be argued that the ongoing operational expenses for the LBPH program should be supported with State funds. In fact, Congress has always seen the NLS service as a cooperative effort between the Federal government and the states. The ideal model for the NLS service has always been the provision of recordings, playback equipment, and free-matter for the blind mailing privileges by the Federal government, with the states supplying staffing and facilities for the program.

Indiana is not unusual in spending LSTA dollars to support Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (LBPH) services. It is one of many states that do so. While we believe that the decision to use LSTA funds in this fashion is consistent with the Library Services and Technology Act's priorities, at the same time, we question the heavy dependence on Federal funds for what is obviously an ongoing program.

Recommendation B.1.
The Indiana State Library should work with the state's various "disabilities communities" and with the Indiana State Legislature to determine ways to shift some of the operational costs of the LBPH program to State funding while using LSTA funds to enhance library and information services to individuals with disabilities and to other special needs populations.

We also believe that a good argument can be made that the expenditure of LSTA dollars in at least some State institutions is enabling the continuation of sub-standard library service. In fact, the consultants believe that greater LSTA support should be provided to efforts designed to

improve library services in institutions over the long-term
rather than to what might be seen as "band-aid" solutions.

Recommendation B.2.
**The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State
Library Advisory Council should explore ways to use
LSTA funds to encourage the long-term development of
quality library services in State institutions.**

A continuation of some funding for end-user programs is
probably advisable while methods of encouraging the
development of quality institution-based library services
are explored.

It was noted above, the LSTA program has had only a
minimal impact to date on the way in which Indiana's
libraries approach services to people with disabilities. A
careful reading of Goal 3 would make it appear that greater
effort should be made in this area if the State library is
serious about enabling local libraries to improve their
services to special needs populations.

A model worthy of consideration is one underway in
Massachusetts. That State is providing LSTA grants to
support a "Planning Process for People with Disabilities."
This effort has received national attention and the
Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library
Agencies (ASCLA) is publishing an adapted version of the
process for use by other states.

The notion of offering libraries grants for the purchase of
adaptive technologies (as was done with LSCA funds) is
attractive given LSTA's emphasis on technology.
However, it should be noted that end-users must be
engaged in such projects to make them a success.

Recommendation B.3.
**The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State
Library Advisory Council should consider the
development of an LSTA-funded initiative aimed at the
improvement of local library services to persons with
disabilities.**

In summary, the consultants conclude that the Indiana State
Library has done a better job of maintaining current, highly

valued services than it has done in enabling public libraries to improve service to special needs populations. We recognize that Goal 3 represents a formidable challenge. There are many unserved and underserved populations that need to be considered under this goal. However, we are confident that the Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council will do so as they work on the next five-year plan.

PROGRESS ON GOAL 4:
Serve individuals with literacy or learning needs by enabling libraries to improve service to those individuals.

Goal 4 in the Indiana State Library's LSTA plan addresses learning needs of many types. Literacy is included; however, so is professional development for library staff, consulting assistance to libraries and the establishment of distance education sites to facilitate a whole range of learning activities.

Two different strategies have been used in Indiana's literacy efforts under LSTA. The first involves the provision of materials and technological resources to institutional libraries to enable them to provide improved literacy services to institutional residents. The second, more general strategy, has been to strengthen literacy efforts statewide through the support of Initiatives of the Indiana Literacy Foundation.

Professional staff development efforts have also followed several tracks. A great deal of high-quality continuing education related to the INSPIRE project has been provided to library staff members through contracts with INCOLSA. In addition, the Indiana State Library has embarked on a sizeable distance learning initiative. Finally, additional staff development has been accomplished through LSTA support for consulting staff in ISL's Library Development Office.

LSTA support for literacy efforts in State institutions is greatly appreciated but has limited impact. This is largely due to the fact that financial support for the program is also limited. Approximately $ 50,000 is allocated each year to support efforts in forty-one eligible institutions.

Each year the Special Services Committee and the Special Services Consultant identify "incentive collections" of materials (These have been reference books, encyclopedias, and a 35 volume set of "Eye-Witness" books.) that are awarded to the institutional libraries that apply for the literacy grants. The incentive collections usually account for approximately $ 5,000 of the $ 50,000 allocation. The balance of the $ 50,000 is used to fund specific grants of roughly $ 2,000 each to individual institutions.

While the motivation behind awarding these grants is commendable, and while many individuals in the institutions have received some benefit from the grants, $ 2,000 per year is hardly enough to make a significant impact in libraries that are, with only a few exceptions, very poorly supported to begin with. In some cases, the LSTA grants represent the total amount available for the purchase of new materials and/or technology resources.

The consultants believe that literacy efforts in State institutions need greater support and attention than they are currently receiving. The various institutions vary considerably in size and in the characteristics of their residents. A one-size-fits-all approach to grants is largely ineffective in the face of tremendous needs. We reiterate a recommendation made under Goal 3 as a strategy for approaching this situation.

Recommendation B.2.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should explore ways to use LSTA funds to encourage the long-term development of quality library services (including literacy services) in State institutions.

We would be remiss if we did not express the importance of the work of the Special Services Committee. There has been, and will continue to be, a real benefit to bringing those responsible for institutional library services together to discuss service needs. It is clear that this activity should continue.

The Indiana State Library has also participated in a major initiative designed to strengthen local volunteer literacy efforts. Twenty thousand dollars have been awarded to the

Indiana Literacy Foundation for developing the Literacy Accountability System (LAS) and the Literacy Success Network in each fiscal year. The State Library's support represents a partnership with the Lilly Foundation, which is also funding the Literacy foundation's efforts in these areas.

The Literacy Success Network is a listserv open to all literacy programs, including adult basic education, nationwide. Currently there are approximately 300 organizations on the listserv. The Foundation uses the listserv to communicate information on meetings, programs, grants, and other useful information to those organizations. The organizations themselves use the listserv to report successes, problems, issues, etc.

The Literacy Accountability System provides a mechanism for gathering and distributing data on adult literacy programs as well as a means whereby best practices can be identified and shared. LAS also involves a listserv, which is open to participating literacy programs. The data gathered through this system will be most useful in measuring the progress being made by the programs and for documenting needs and progress for future granting institutions.

Although twenty volunteer-based literacy programs in Indiana were involved in the LAS pilot project, only twelve programs have continued to participate. This is perhaps not too surprising since volunteer-based programs often have little or no paid staff and often have trouble collecting and updating project data. The Indiana Literacy Foundation Executive Director has indicated that the level of enthusiasm of the twelve continuing programs remains high and some of the initial participants that have dropped out have indicated a desire to rejoin the program.

It is estimated that there are over 200 volunteer-based literacy programs in Indiana and the Foundation will likely continue to seek on-going funding to encourage additional programs to join the LAS. Costs for being a part of LAS include purchase of a computer, the software for LAS, and training in using the system.

The consultants believe that efforts to strengthen local literacy programs through the Indiana Literacy Foundation are sensible. Support of the Foundation's activities

represents a valid attempt to leverage limited dollars to achieve a statewide impact. We believe that the development of a program of incentives to local literacy organizations to enable them to participate in the LAS program in partnership with their local libraries might result in considerable impact.

Recommendation B.4.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should consider an initiative that would enable local literacy organizations to participate in the Literacy Accountability System in partnership with their local public library.

LSTA-funded staff training, particularly training related to technology and the INSPIRE project, was widely praised by Indiana's librarians. Training contracted to INCOLSA was specifically singled out for its relevance and high quality.

The consultants believe that awarding grants to INCOLSA to provide specific, targeted training is a very astute practice. It represents what some strategic planners refer to as a "robust strategy," i.e., doing a single thing that positively impacts several goals. Contracts with INCOLSA for continuing education ensure the provision of quality staff development while at the same time strengthening that organization. This is important to the general health of the Indiana Library community in that organizations such as INCOLSA are somewhat less constrained by political and bureaucratic realities than are state agencies such as the Indiana State Library. Because of this, INCOLSA is able to react to emerging needs more quickly than can ISL. In contracting with INCOLSA, the State Library is purchasing flexibility as well as a quality staff development product.

The consultants believe that ISL's award of LSTA funding to the Indiana Library Federation (ILF) to develop and carry out the public awareness campaign for the INSPIRE program is commendable for similar reasons. Several individuals interviewed agreed expressing the opinion that the joint involvement of INCOLSA, ISL, and ILF has been beneficial to the unity of the Indiana library community.

Recommendation B.5.
The Indiana State Library should continue its practice of working with INCOLSA to ensure the availability of quality staff development offerings on specific topics.

The collaboration between INCOLSA and ISL on staff development also makes sense in relation to the Distance Learning (DL) Initiative. The fact that INCOLSA is a primary partner with ISL in this effort increases the potential for the use of the DL system since it becomes an obvious tool to consider in this framework.

The Distance Learning initiative itself is still very much a work in progress. It has yet to fully realize its potential. The Indiana library community's foray into the world of distance education has been rather frustrating. For example, one interviewee described an event where 40 people were crowded around a speaker-phone because they were unable to establish a reliable link to the DL system. Unfortunately, reports from librarians indicate that negative experiences such as this have been far too common.

Nevertheless, the consultants agree with the ISL (and what appears to be a majority of the library community) that the project has great potential for making training and continuing education (as well as programming) more accessible and affordable.

While there continue to be some technical problems with the DL system, it appears as if progress *is* being made. Several recent programs involving multiple sites have worked well and ISL and INCOLSA have been busily working to secure access to new content that can be offered using the system. Now that most of the technical problems seem to be under control, frequent use of the system will probably do more than anything else to move the initiative forward.

It is important to note that the potential for the DL system goes far beyond staff development, continuing education, and enabling virtual meetings for library staff. Libraries that have secured the DL equipment through LSTA grants and those who have acquired compatible systems through e-rate funding will be able to offer a whole range of educational programming that has been unavailable in the past. Cooperative efforts with public schools and effort

with institutions of higher learning through the Indiana Higher Education Telecommunications Services (IHETS) program should also lead to exciting new service prospects for libraries.

Recommendation B.6.
The Indiana State Library should continue to invest LSTA resources in the Distance Learning initiative. In particular, efforts should stress:
1. **improving the reliability of the system,**
2. **increasing the availability of content, and,**
3. **fostering cooperation with educational and non-profit partners in distance learning.**

Finally, it should be noted that distance learning technologies are not suitable for all types of education and training experiences. ISL and INCOLSA need to continue their ongoing efforts to offer face-to-face, hands-on training especially in relation to types of technology training that benefit from personal interaction. Furthermore, distance learning technologies such as web-based instruction need to be actively pursued in addition to the current efforts in videoconferencing technology.

LSTA-paid positions at the Indiana State Library impact all goal areas. LSTA dollars are used to support positions in the State Library's Reference and Indiana Divisions, in the Special Services Division, and in the Library Development Office. The work of these individuals ranges from the provision of direct service to end users to consulting and technical assistance and from administrative oversight of the LSTA program to representing the Indiana State Library on boards and committees related to literacy and disabilities.

Our evaluation reveals that the Indiana library community appreciates the hard work and dedication of the Indiana State Library's Library Development Office personnel, which was described as "overworked and understaffed." Development staff members, including those paid with LSTA funds, were described as "…competent, responsive, and always willing to help." The consulting advice, technical assistance, and moral support provided to public libraries, especially to small public libraries, are seen as invaluable.

While some of the work performed by LSTA paid consulting positions relates directly to efforts in support of the staff development ends of Goal 4, other work relates closely to other goal areas. For example, the Special Services Coordinator is a key element that contributes to success in Goals 3 and 4. Staff involved in planning and administration of the LSTA program obviously impact all five goal areas.

It appears that the LSTA-funded staff in the Library Development Office are fully engaged in activities that further the LSTA goals. Furthermore, the arrival of the Gates Initiative in Indiana and the need to coordinate the development of the next LSTA five-year plan will place increased demands on Library Development Office staff in the near future. The consultants believe that the use of LSTA dollars for staff in these areas is most appropriate.

Perhaps not surprisingly, librarians in the field are considerably less aware and consequently, perhaps less appreciative of the impact of LSTA-funded positions that provide services to individuals who are blind and/or physically challenged and staff that serve in reference and data center capacities. These are simply not staff members with whom they interact on a regular basis.

Awareness of the LBPH program is, of course higher in the libraries that host subregional operations and the consultants heard no complaints or negative comments from focus group participants, interviewees, or survey respondents regarding the use of LSTA funds to support the LBPH program. However, the consultants wish to reiterate the point made in relation to Recommendation B.1. that the extensive use LSTA funds to support this aspect of service hinders other efforts at serving special needs population.

The statewide impact of LSTA funding for reference/data center positions is hard to measure and consequently difficult to evaluate. It is not that the incumbents in the positions are not providing valuable services to Indiana residents. It is clear that they do. However, it appears to the consultants that the ties between these positions and the stated goals for the LSTA program are somewhat tenuous.

The positions are justified on the basis of enhancing web access to State Library resources and extending the use of

statistical resources through consultation and training offered to the 29 affiliate data centers in the State.

Recommendation B.7.
The Indiana State Library needs to review its current use of LSTA funding for Reference/Data Center positions with an eye toward expanding the relevance of these efforts to the LSTA goals and awareness of these efforts in the library community.

In summary, progress toward Goal 4 has been mixed. The impact of literacy initiatives, while significant in terms of individuals in institutions who have benefited from the availability of specific resources, has nevertheless been marginal. Success has been considerably greater in the realm of staff development. Both continuing education and the consulting activities of ISL staff have had an impact on libraries throughout the State. Finally, the distance learning initiative, while having great potential, has yet to realize its promise.

PROGRESS ON GOAL 5:
Enable libraries to support innovative projects.

The Indiana State Library has used LSTA dollars to support experimentation and new service delivery methods in libraries through the awarding of competitive "innovation" grants. Goal 5 encourages innovation in areas that are directly related to the other four goals. The purpose of this grant program is not innovation for innovation's sake. It is, rather, innovation to achieve specific ends described in Goals 1 through 4.

Innovation certainly has its place in the LSTA program. Although not formally categorized as an "innovative" project, the INSPIRE program illustrates the benefit of innovative demonstrations on the library community. One person said of INSPIRE, "It opened our eyes to let us see what is possible."

LSTA funds have been used to support innovative projects as varied as the Muncie - Center Township Public Library "Cybermobile," digitization of a selection of the Indiana University's Hoagy Carmichael collection, and experimentation with wireless technologies. Innovative

34

projects inspire other libraries to try new things, they offer
the opportunity for small-scale successes or failures that
provide valuable information to libraries that are
considering heading down the same or similar path, and
they provide a newsworthy focal point for library public
awareness efforts.

However, a concern has emerged in relation to this goal
recently. As more libraries, particularly school libraries,
have become active in seeking competitive grants,
maximum awards have been decreased to the point that
many in the Indiana library community believe that the
innovative spirit has been suppressed. Ironically, success
in implementing the multitype character of the Library
Services and Technology Act seems to have dampened a
desirable emphasis on innovation.

The Indiana State Library has placed a cap on the
maximum amount of innovative grant awards to individual
libraries each year. The cap has varied from a high of
$ 20,000 to the current low of $ 5,000. (Similar caps exist
for competitive technology grants.) While larger amounts
are available for grants that involve "collaborative
partnerships," many in the library community have raised
doubts that much in the way of truly innovative service
delivery will happen with such a small incentive. The
consultants heard many calls for increasing the size of
innovative grants even if it means that far fewer grants are
awarded.

Recommendation B.8.
**The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State
Library Advisory Council should closely examine the
LSTA budget to determine whether it is feasible to
allocate a larger amount of money to the "Innovative"
grant category.**

Recommendation B.9.
**Regardless of whether or not additional funds are
allocated to the "Innovative" grant category, maximum
award levels for individual libraries should be increased
to at least $ 20,000.**

In summary, the Indiana State Library has had notable
success in accomplishing Goal 5. Many outstanding
projects that have been carried out have had significant

local and/or statewide impact. Unfortunately, the consultants believe that the ongoing success in regard to Goal 5 is being threatened by the small size of grant awards.

An Analysis of the Indiana State Library's Administration of the LSTA Program

Finding C:
The Indiana State Library has administered the LSTA program well.

The consultants believe that the Indiana State Library has administered the LSTA program fairly, equitably and within the spirit of the Federal Act. The library community agrees with the goals established for the program and believes that the ISL has done an excellent job of using LSTA dollars in concert with other Federal funds, (e.g., e-rate) and State funds for specific initiatives (e.g., INSPIRE, telecommunications initiatives).

While some believe that there should be greater participation from the field in determining annual priorities and establishing the specifics regarding competitive grant categories, most believe that ISL and ISLAC have done an admirable job. Perhaps the greatest compliment came from a librarian who commented, "It's uncanny, LSTA has provided just what we needed when we needed it." The consultants are convinced that careful planning rather than luck accounts for the convergence of need and LSTA-funded program activity.

The State Library has also done a good job of making the grant application process simple and straightforward. The consultants found wide praise for changes that have made applying for grants easier. We found little evidence that any library is discouraged from applying for a grant simply because they perceive the application process to be a burden.

Quite a number of complaints were heard about reporting requirements. While most acknowledged that the State Library's responsibility to be accountable to the Federal government brings the necessity for evaluation and

reporting with it, there appears to be an increasing concern that reporting must be streamlined. This opinion was expressed even by those who felt that reporting requirements have been reasonable in the past. The small size of most grant awards appears to be the factor that is influencing a change in opinion. Many interview and focus group participants pointed out that effort in administering grants needs to be commensurate with the size of the award. The consultants fear that reporting requirements may become a factor that discourages participation in the LSTA competitive grant process if they are not addressed.

Recommendation C.1.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should review current evaluation and reporting requirements and should attempt to streamline the process especially as they relate to grants less than $ 20,000.

A examination of individual grant files indicates that many libraries that receive grants do not submit all of the required evaluation reports. There is evidence that the State Library does attempt to follow-up with libraries that have not completed their evaluative reports; however, it is also apparent that some libraries fail to respond even when reminded of their reporting obligations. This may be a defense mechanism related to the previously mentioned concern about the balance between the magnitude of grants and the rigor of reporting. Nevertheless, the consultants believe that the lack of full documentation on grants is a problem. It should be noted that it is the evaluative reporting and *not* financial reporting that appears to be the greatest problem.

The consultants believe that two remedial steps need to be taken to address this problem. The first is contained in Recommendation C.1. above, that is, the reporting process needs to be streamlined. The second relates to the value and usefulness of the evaluations. The consultants heard little that led them to believe that the library community as a whole is gaining a benefit from the evaluation that *is* performed. For the most part, libraries see the evaluation of LSTA grants as a necessary chore rather than as a valuable process that can be used to inform future decision making.

Recommendation C.2.
In working to streamline the evaluation and reporting process, the Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should examine ways to make the evaluation process more valuable both to the libraries doing the evaluation and to the rest of the library community.

The consultants are aware of several states that use peer evaluation systems with their LSTA programs. Under this system, librarians from other libraries are involved in the assessment of projects. This process relieves the library implementing the grant from some of the administrative burden, ensures the completion of a detailed evaluation of each project, and provides for an objective, external assessment. However, the peer evaluation process does cost money (peer evaluators are usually paid some sort of a stipend) and would be hard to justify for small grants.

Several states are also making efforts (urged on by IMLS) to adopt an outcome-based evaluation model which is structured on efforts pioneered by the United Way. The Florida Division of Library and Information Services (Florida's state library agency) has developed a program that could be adopted by Indiana.

Recommendation C.3.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should consider the development of an outcome-based assessment program or the adaptation of an existing model to make grant evaluation more relevant and useful.

Perhaps the area of greatest criticism of the Indiana State Library's administration of the LSTA program is the system used for reimbursement of libraries. Representatives of many small libraries reported that the process was burdensome. While the reimbursement process is arguably preferable from an accountability standpoint, many states do use processes that provide full or partial advanced payments to libraries. While the consultants recognize that this aspect of the LSTA program is governed by regulations imposed by the Indiana State Board of Accounts, we believe that it is necessary to mention that this aspect of the LSTA program is troublesome for some small libraries and

that it probably impedes some libraries from applying for grants. The consultants believe that the Indiana State Library should explore with the State Board of Accounts whether some method of maintaining a high level of accountability while overcoming this problem is feasible in the State of Indiana.

Recommendation C.4.
The Indiana State Library should explore with the State Board of Accounts to determine the feasibility of some sort of advanced payment process in relation to at least small LSTA grant awards.

Partnering and collaboration are controversial topics within the Indiana library community. A number of individuals interviewed indicated strong support for the LSTA's strong emphasis on collaboration. However, others described partnership efforts as burdensome and often contrived.

The consultants agree with a library director who, in the course of an interview, offered that, "the partnering aspect of LSTA is key… one of the most important things that LSTA does is break down walls." Building strong relationships between libraries and between libraries and other community organizations is a worthy goal in itself.

Unfortunately, it appears that many members of the Indiana library community have either had bad experiences with collaborative projects or do not fully understand the benefits of partnership relationships. Collaboration is difficult and can lead to less than satisfactory results. In our experience, most unsatisfactory experiences are the result of collaboration being added-on to a project rather than being built-in to a project.

Recommendation C.5.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should allocate LSTA resources to fund an institute or a series of workshops on the topic of building successful partnerships.

Interestingly, Indiana's own Indianapolis - Marion County Public Library (IMCPL) has exhibited real leadership and success in partnering initiatives. IMCPL may be a source of good information on successful partnerships.

The Indiana State Library may also wish to consider a
model used by the Massachusetts Board of Library
Commissioners (MBLC). MBLC has used a process in
which LSTA funds are used to sponsor a high quality
institute on a topic. Grant applications for projects related
to that topic are then accepted only from libraries that
participated in the institute.

An Analysis of the Geographic Distribution of LSTA Grant Awards in Indiana

Finding D:
**The process used to award LSTA grants has resulted in
the broad geographic distribution of grant awards.**

A thorough examination of the geographic distribution of
LSTA grants throughout the State of Indiana reveals that
libraries from all parts of the state have received grants
over the last three years. The consultants considered all
competitive grants awarded during the 1998, 1999, and
2000 fiscal years in their analysis. Each grant was
associated with the county within which the administering
library, school, or institution is located. The results show a
wide geographic distribution which has, in fact, grown
considerably in recent years.

A library or libraries in 39 of Indiana's 92 counties have
been the recipients of grants in each of the three years
reviewed. This represents over forty-two percent (42.39%)
of the counties. Libraries in an additional 33 counties
received grants in two of the three years. This accounts for
another thirty-six percent (35.87%) of the total. In other
words, a library or libraries in 72 of Indiana's 92 counties
have benefited from an LSTA award in FY 1998, 1999, or
2000. Furthermore, grants were given to a library or
libraries in 19 of the remaining 20 counties in at least one
of the three grant cycles. The consultants discovered only
one county (Ripley) in which no library had received a
direct grant in the last three complete fiscal years.

The consultants looked at the twenty counties with
relatively low LSTA activity (the one county with no grants
and the nineteen with grants in only one of the three years)
to see if any commonalties emerged. Thirteen of the

40

twenty counties can be characterized as being in the southeast (7), southwest (4), or south-central (2) portion of the state. An additional four counties are located in the east-central part of the state. Only three of the counties are in the north (northwest - 1, north-central 1 - northeast 1). Most of the counties have relatively small populations. County populations in this group range from 5,623 (Ohio) to 70,823 (Floyd); however, the average of the group is 25,103. If Floyd County is removed from the mix, the average drops to 22,697 inhabitants.

The twenty counties that have had limited involvement with LSTA have an average of less than two public libraries per county (1.75) and the libraries tend to be open slightly fewer hours than average. These two factors (a limited number of libraries to apply for grants and the limited staffing available to write and administer grants) may explain the lower level of LSTA activity in at least some of the counties.

It should also be noted that the number of libraries awarded grants and the number of counties served by these libraries increased significantly over the three-year period. Libraries in 53 of the 92 counties received grants in FY 1998 (57.61% of the 92 counties). In FY 1999, libraries in 72 counties (78.26% of the 92 counties) were awarded grants. Finally, in FY 2000, libraries in 77 counties (83.69% of the 92 counties) were grant recipients.

It is also significant to note that the number of schools and school districts receiving grants has increased substantially and that total grant activity in a number of counties is based on this greater penetration into the realm of school library/media centers. A few counties are also included among those with libraries that have received grants on the basis of literacy grant awards to institutions. These facts are important because limited or special populations are the target audiences for these grants as opposed to awards to public libraries that are more likely to be aimed at the general public.

Finally, the geographic analysis of the grants also revealed that many of the large public libraries in the state seldom, if ever, apply for competitive LSTA grants. Based on information received in interviews with library directors, this may well be due to the small size of most grant awards.

The consultants did not detect a high level of animosity toward the LSTA program from the directors of large libraries who were interviewed. Quite to the contrary, most were very supportive of the LSTA program and were complimentary of the State Library for their handling of LSTA and a variety of State initiatives.

Nevertheless, the consultants believe that the entire Indiana library community derives benefits from the active engagement of libraries of all sizes in the LSTA program. We also believe that the availability of larger competitive grants in the technology and innovation categories might encourage participation.

Recommendation D.1.
The Indiana State Library and the Indiana State Library Advisory Council should explore the question of why large public libraries apply for relatively few LSTA grants and should consider strategies that would encourage a higher level of participation by these libraries.

An Analysis by Selected Grant Programs

The Plan for Evaluation submitted to IMLS identified four programs for additional in-depth review. Under each of the four programs, a series of questions was raised. Most of the questions relate to the effectiveness and/or impact of the specific programs. The four program areas identified were:

> **Library Technology Grants,**
> **the INSPIRE Virtual Library Project,**
> **Distance Learning Grants, and,**
> **Institutional Literacy Grants.**

The consultants' level of success in answering the questions related to these programs varied significantly from program to program. Since the evaluation project did not include a mechanism for direct interaction with end users, the consultants had to rely on evaluations submitted by grantees, on data gathered through interviews with State Library Staff, INCOLSA staff, and individual librarians, and on input from focus group participants.

The consultants found considerable evidence of success in most of the programs; however, much of the evidence was anecdotal and general rather than carefully documented as an integral part of the specific projects. The evaluation component included in many grant applications appeared to be "added-on" rather than "built-in" to projects. And while many projects identified desirable end-user impacts, few included evaluation methodologies that would determine whether these impacts occurred.

Some problems in the overall evaluation process used by ISL were noted earlier in this report and the consultants offer several recommendations (C.2, and C.3) that address these problems. It should also be noted that, at least in part, the ISL's good efforts to streamline the LSTA grant processes and to make grants widely available place some limits on what can be expected in the way of evaluation. The relatively small amount of many of the grants that are awarded limits the feasibility of imposing rigorous evaluation requirements.

Evaluative information collected on some of the programs, in particular the INSPIRE project, was good. ISL has made a considerable effort to collect information about the impact of this program on end users. Considerably less information is available regarding the impact of some of the projects undertaken by individual libraries and regarding the Distance Learning project.

Following is a specific look at each of the four identified programs including responses to each of the questions raised in the Plan for Evaluation.

Library Technology Grants

One of the real strengths of the Library Technology Grant program has been its flexibility. LSTA dollars have been used to help some libraries address very basic connectivity needs. Funds have enabled somewhat more advanced libraries to make their catalogs available on the Internet. Technology grants have afforded libraries the opportunity to experiment with wireless networks and digitize unique local collections thereby making these resources more accessible.

Rather than being a "one-size-fits-all" program, ISL and ISLAC have successfully crafted a program that has served to improve the technological capabilities of a wide range of libraries. The program helped some libraries address "Y2K" concerns. More importantly, it significantly increased the public's access to the Internet and to online catalogs representing the holdings of Indiana libraries.

What have the grants allowed libraries to do that they were unable to do prior to the grant funding?

As was noted above, the Technology Grant program has allowed different libraries to do different things; however, taken as a whole, the impact of the program has been the vast improvement of the technological capabilities of Indiana libraries and a considerable improvement in public access to electronic resources.

What has the impact of the grants been on the public that uses the libraries?

The Technology Grant program has had a positive impact on the public in three major areas. They are:

- an increase in the quantity of computers available for public use in libraries,
- an improvement in the speed and quality of Internet and local network connections, and,
- an increase in the range of electronic resources available through computers located in libraries, homes, and offices.

Several participants in interviews and focus groups indicated that the improved technology available in libraries is also changing the public's perception of libraries. Others indicated that the widespread availability of the Internet in libraries has also attracted more young adults to the library.

Is Indiana focusing on the right areas for technology grants?

Indiana's Technology Grant program has been very successful in two ways. First, it has remained focused on technology as a means of improving the public's access to information rather than on technology as an end in itself.

44

Second, the program has been flexible enough to adjust to changing needs. For example, in FY 1999, LSTA dollars were used to fund 57 Y2K upgrades, 75 local area network (LAN) installations or upgrades, and 7 digitization projects. While LSTA dollars continued to be available for building LANs in FY 2000 (17 schools and 35 public libraries), funding was also provided for 35 grants that enabled libraries to put their catalogs on the Internet, for 16 digitization projects and for 9 projects that involved using technology in ways not previously carried out in Indiana libraries. In other words, ISL has not abandoned libraries that still have basic technology needs; however, it has also moved to embrace higher level technological needs as they emerge.

Have grants allowed libraries to advance more rapidly or are they just replacing local dollars?

The consultants' interaction with members of Indiana's library community confirms that LSTA has accelerated the technological progress of the state's libraries to a considerable degree. There was almost unanimous agreement that LSTA had enabled libraries to move forward at a much faster pace than would have been possible with local funds alone.

Rather than replacing local dollars, there were some indications that LSTA grants enabled some libraries to gain additional local funds both from public and private sources. The awarding of a Federal grant for a project was seen as adding legitimacy to library efforts to improve technology. One librarian indicated that getting an LSTA grant helped her move a hesitant Library Board toward an expansion of public access to electronic resources.

Are smaller grants as effective as larger ones?

The Technology Grants program has been an extremely popular one. Many grants funded at less than $ 5,000 each have been successful and have accomplished their stated goals. However, it should be noted that most successful small grants have been highly focused to accomplish a very specific limited task such as retrospective conversion of a limited number of bibliographic records or for the purpose of buying a specific piece of equipment or software to enable web access to an existing automated catalog.

45

Library users in the State of Indiana have clearly benefited from these grants.

However, it is also clear that the relatively small size of the current technology grants limits the degree to which libraries can attempt innovative technology projects. The cap placed on technology grants also discourages larger libraries from applying for grants. The impact of a $ 5,000 grant on the services of a library serving 50,000 people or more (22 eligible public libraries in Indiana fit this criteria) is very likely to be less than the impact of a similar grant on services offered by a library serving 7,000 or less (67 eligible public libraries in Indiana fit this criteria).

Several factors have entered into the decision to reduce the cap on technology grants. First and foremost is the fact that a limited amount of LSTA funding is available. A second factor is that ISL and ISLAC have opened the program to school and academic libraries as well as to public libraries. The addition of 1900 public school libraries and over 70 academic libraries to the mix increases the number of library buildings eligible for grants nearly five-fold! Finally, as noted above, many small grants have been effective. The decision to reduce the top amount of individual grants is not without thought or reason. To the contrary, it is a very well reasoned step designed to address a real dilemma.

However, the consultants believe that ISL and ISLAC should also consider additional alternatives. We are familiar with a number of states that have addressed this conundrum by offering a combination of "mini-grants" with relatively low pre-set limits as well "full grants" or "open grants" with a significantly higher cap. The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners has been particularly successful in creating mini-grant programs based on models created under successful major grants. Indiana may want to consider a considerable increase in the cap for a limited number of innovative grants as a way to encourage innovative grants while maintaining a lower maximum amount for technology grants designed to address routine needs.

Is there a measurable increased access to information (digital, shared catalogs, etc.) after 3 years of technology grants?

As has been noted earlier in this report, the consultants believe that the Indiana State Library has done a masterful job of using State program funding, LSTA dollars, and other Federal funding sources to complement each other. While it is somewhat difficult to break out the impact of LSTA funding on the overall technological progress made by Indiana libraries, there is simply no question that the combined effect of State and Federal funds has been nothing short of amazing.

The number of libraries with Internet access, the number of libraries with local area networks, the number of libraries with web-accessible catalogs, and the number of computers available to the public in libraries have all increased substantially since the first LSTA grants were awarded. When the increase in the digital content that is available through INSPIRE and through digitization projects is considered, it becomes clear that the Technology Grant program used in concert with other State and Federal programs has played a considerable role in transforming the nature and quantity of information services available to Indiana residents.

INSPIRE

As has been stated previously, the consultants believe that the INSPIRE program is a model project in many ways. The program has had statewide impact on end users, has effectively used a combination of State and Federal funds, and has strengthened other agencies that support libraries (INCOLSA and the Indiana Library Federation) while delivering a service that is highly valued by the public.

Nevertheless, as with any program, there is still room for improvement. The questions regarding the INSPIRE program that were raised in the "Plan for the Evaluation" provide a good outline for examining the program's strengths and weaknesses.

Has there been enough training and has it been effective?

Clearly, INSPIRE training has been effective. The consultants received positive feedback regarding INSPIRE training from librarians throughout the State of Indiana. The quality of both the content included in training sessions and the personnel providing the training was applauded widely. However, there is also evidence that suggests that INSPIRE training needs to be viewed as an ongoing task and that it needs to be broadened beyond the library community.

Changes in the products offered through INSPIRE and the interfaces used to access these products as well as staff turnover in libraries will necessitate ongoing training for librarians. Furthermore, many of the librarians who participated in focus groups and interviews felt that much remains to be done in acquainting the public with INSPIRE's rich resources. In short, while the INSPIRE training to date has been effective, it is likely that there will never be "enough" INSPIRE training.

How many people actually use INSPIRE after training?

The INSPIRE program faces the same "branding" challenges that confront commercial products. It is clear that a large percentage of Indiana residents now think "Internet" when they have information needs. There is ample evidence that only a small fraction of these people think "INSPIRE."

There are two distinct sets of INSPIRE users that require training in using the electronic resources offered. They are:

- library staff, and,
- the public.

The consultants found many enthusiastic INSPIRE users among the many librarians who participated in focus groups and interviews. Awareness of the program appears to be very high among staff. While there were some reports of staff who have been slow to embrace INSPIRE, these reports were relatively few compared to the chorus of praise that came from frequent users. Several representatives of small libraries expressed the opinion that

INSPIRE had enabled their libraries to offer a new, higher level of reference service. All indications are that a high number of staff members who are trained to use INSPIRE resources use at least some of these resources.

It appears that use of INSPIRE resources by the public varies significantly. Many libraries have encouraged INSPIRE use in a variety of ways including prominent placement of a link to INSPIRE on library web pages and periodic training opportunities. Reports of subsequent use seem to be tied directly to the relevance of the training experience to specific information needs. For example, high school students who are directed to specific resources related to their research or homework needs are more likely to turn to INSPIRE again in the future than are individuals who receive generic training.

Informing more people about INSPIRE and encouraging them use INSPIRE resources through training remains a high priority in the Indiana library community. Over eighty percent of respondents to the survey agreed or strongly agreed that, "most people don't know about INSPIRE." Ongoing training of both staff and the public is seen as an avenue to encouraging use. Almost sixty-nine percent (68.91%) of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that training for library/media center staff should remain a priority. Two thirds (66.67%) were supportive of training targeted toward the public.

How have the INSPIRE promotional spots and materials impacted the use of INSPIRE? Has publicity reached intended audiences?

It is hard to imagine *too much* INSPIRE training or *too much* publicity about the INSPIRE program. However, as was mentioned by one of the librarians interviewed in the course of the evaluation, "you could easily spend more on publicizing the program than you spend on licensing the databases… it's hard to figure out the right level."

The ISL and ISLAC are to be complimented for their decision to include a significant public awareness component in the INSPIRE program. Nevertheless, the promotion of *any* service on a statewide basis is a formidable task. There is little evidence to indicate that a large number of people have used INSPIRE because of

promotional spots. The web-based survey revealed that a majority of Indiana librarians believe that the public is largely unaware of the INSPIRE program. A total of 80.83% of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "Most people in Indiana still don't know about INSPIRE." A number of focus group and interview participants indicated that, for the most part, the public finds out about INSPIRE at the time when they need specific information and a librarian guides them to INSPIRE as an appropriate resource that will meet their need.

This is *not* to say that LSTA dollars invested in INSPIRE publicity have been wasted. To the contrary, the consultants found ample evidence to suggest that the public's perception of libraries is changing to one that includes technology and electronic resources. INSPIRE publicity *may* be responsible for bringing some individuals into the library who subsequently discover INSPIRE.

The consultants believe that public awareness efforts related to INSPIRE should continue; however, we also believe that any new publicity campaigns should be targeted to specific audiences such as students, teachers, or individuals with specific topical needs (e.g. business people, health professionals, etc.).

How has INSPIRE impacted end users?

Librarians across Indiana had stories to tell about individuals who were impacted by the INSPIRE program. They ranged from students to businesspersons and from young people to seniors. Representatives of small libraries mentioned that INSPIRE enabled them to help users that would have had to go to a larger library or would have had to wait for interlibrary loan in the past.

Several representatives from larger libraries indicated that their libraries would likely subscribe to the databases included in INSPIRE with or without state or LSTA funding; however, they were quick to add that state and LSTA support has enabled them to purchase other electronic and print resources.

Is INSPIRE the first search engine they use, the second, or one of the last?

There is little or no evidence that large numbers of people turn to INSPIRE as their primary search tool from their home or office computers. However, many Indiana libraries feature INSPIRE prominently on their web sites. There are even some libraries (particularly school libraries) that use INSPIRE as their default page.

It is likely that the public will continue to utilize generic search engines such as Yahoo and Google as points of entry into the Internet. However, it is also likely that more and more Indiana residents will bookmark INSPIRE for specific kinds of searches.

The consultants believe that strategies aimed at adding more and more content to INSPIRE (both additional databases and other content developed by libraries throughout the state) will encourage more people to make INSPIRE their second or third choice even if it isn't their initial point of entry.

What additional programs and services have librarians been able to provide because of savings incurred by the provision of free databases through a state grant and operational funds through LSTA?

First, it should be noted that there are many libraries (mostly small public libraries and school libraries, but even a few small academic libraries) that simply would not be able to afford the kinds of resources available through INSPIRE. While these libraries haven't incurred savings, INSPIRE has markedly improved their ability to serve their clientele.

Many medium-sized libraries and most large libraries have benefited from the savings that come from the group licensing of databases through INSPIRE. The first area of savings is that aggregating demand (licensing on behalf of all libraries) brings overall costs down. State licensing is considerably less expensive than if each individual library in the state licensed the same databases on behalf of their own communities. The second area of savings is that libraries can spend the dollars they would otherwise devote to purchasing electronic databases to other purposes.

It does not appear that all of the savings go into the purchase or licensing of other electronic resources. However, it does appear that the vast majority of savings *are* used to purchase resources, albeit a mixture of print and electronic materials. It seems certain that the overall impact of state and LSTA investment in database licensing has been an increase in the availability of both electronic and print materials in Indiana's libraries.

Has LSTA impacted smaller libraries more than larger ones?

INSPIRE has had a marginal impact on most large libraries. It has, however, transformed reference and information services in small libraries. Nevertheless, there is strong support for INSPIRE from libraries of all sizes.

The consultants interviewed the directors of several of the largest libraries in the State. Most offered unqualified support for INSPIRE. Since licensing fees for databases are typically larger for libraries serving larger populations or having more access points (more computers that can access the databases), dollar savings to large libraries are significant. Furthermore, library directors indicated that statewide licensing is a very efficient way of acquiring access.

Others pointed out that school children in Indiana have a significant advantage in that they are able to access the same resources at school and in their public library. This continuity of service is relatively rare. In many other states, database purchasing is done by type of library and schools may license one set of resources while public and academic libraries may license products from different vendors. Indiana's unified model has some distinct advantages.

Finally, one director of a large library said, "what's good for small libraries is good for all libraries if it raises the public's awareness of the ability of libraries to meet their information needs."

Distance Learning

Earlier in this report, the consultants characterized Indiana's Distance Learning (DL) initiatives as a "work in progress." Success in this arena has been quite elusive.

Nevertheless, the consultants found few who felt the initiative should be abandoned. A number of people felt that progress, while slow, was being made.

How many participants have attended distance education programs?

Following is an accounting of videoconference attendance for the last four years:

Year	Attendance	Hours of Use
1998	924	184
1999	1,137	232
2000	1,025	395
2001	*1,546	*NA

*2001 attendance is a "year to date" figure for approximately the first ¾ of the year.

The statistics that are maintained do not account for "duplication." That is, no attempt is made to track the number of distinct individuals who have been involved in distance learning sessions. In fact, it is quite clear from talking to individuals involved in the program at the State Library, at INCOLSA, and at individual sites, that the total number of individuals who have been involved in distance learning events is considerably less than the total attendance. A good number of the same individuals have been involved in many sessions.

However, some statistics that are maintained would indicate that in the last 24 months there has been some significant penetration into the library community. For example, public library budget workshops in 2000 attracted 272 people representing 170 libraries. The 2001 budget workshops attracted 196 individuals.

Are we reaching more people because of the programs offered using distance learning technologies?

Librarians throughout the state are enthusiastic about the promise of distance learning capabilities. The fact that operational sites now exist in diverse locations offer the promise of reduced travel time and expense and opportunities for involving experts from across the country.

However, two important facts should be noted. First, videoconferencing is not suitable for all types of learning experiences. For example, most computer-related topics require significant "hands-on" opportunities. Second, videoconferencing will not be fully embraced unless it proves to be highly reliable. Several people related horror stories from their early experiences with the DL project. One story involved a large group of people gathered around a speakerphone trying to get some benefit from a session after the video link failed. One notable failure (the 2000 Capital Projects Fund Workshop) included over 100 people representing 79 libraries.

Fortunately, steps have been taken that have made the experience more reliable and less technologically challenging for those at the individual sites. A second generation of equipment, more experience, and more reliable connections now in place will go a long way toward addressing past failures.

Is the State Library able to do fewer workshops while reaching more people?

While the answer to this question is without a doubt, "yes," the State Library is just beginning to scratch the surface in regard to what may be possible in the future. The State Library in partnership with INCOLSA and other potential continuing education providers needs to use their DL capabilities more often than they have in the past. However, with the advent of greater success, there may actually be a tendency to push too much into the DL format.

The visibility of the State Library staff in libraries throughout the state is important. As was already mentioned, some topics demand a more hands-on approach. The State Library needs to examine each continuing

education event to determine which method of presentation will be most effective both in reaching the maximum audience and in imparting the greatest amount of information.

Finally, effective teaching using videoconference technologies requires changes in presentation techniques. "Talking heads" often accomplish little either in-person or on the video screen. State Library staff, INCOLSA staff, and whoever else will be teaching using the technology should receive training in techniques that can be used to engage learners at remote sites.

Did the participants save time and expenses by attending distance education programs rather than traditional programs?

Participants unquestionably, save time and money if they are able to travel a short distance to participate in a distance education program instead of traveling a long distance to attend a traditional in-person presentation. However, they have wasted time and money if the presentation is aborted or if an inordinate amount of time is spent getting the technology to work. They have also wasted time and money if the quality of the session is compromised because ineffective teaching techniques are used.

Reliability and quality are the keys to making the distance learning experience both cost-effective and worthwhile.

Are the distance education programs equally effective?

Distance education programs *can* be *equally effective* or even *more effective* than in-person presentations. The effectiveness depends largely on the topic(s) that is/are being presented and the skill of the presenter in using appropriate teaching techniques.

Reports from librarians who have participated in the distance learning sessions were mixed. The horror stories were countered by positive accounts from a few individuals. It appears that everyone is still in the process of learning to use the DL system effectively. Fortunately, the library community seems to be relatively patient and still seems to believe that the system will eventually reach its full potential.

We would reiterate what we mentioned in a previous
section - effective teaching using videoconference
technologies requires changes in presentation techniques.
The Indiana State Library should make sure that presenters,
whether from the State Library or from other organizations,
are well trained and well equipped to use the technology to
its full advantage.

What has the impact on local libraries been?

The DL initiative has had the greatest impact to date on the
libraries that are serving as host sites. These libraries have
had to work through security and scheduling concerns,
have devoted many hours of staff time to making the
systems work, and have experienced both the ecstasy of
success and the agony of defeat! The host libraries are to
be complimented on their patience and their commitment to
the project. It hasn't always been easy.

Nevertheless, these libraries have enjoyed some benefits as
well. The project has afforded a good number of library
staff members some first hand experience with a new
technology, which while still evolving is likely to have a
significant impact on libraries in the years to come.

The impact of the Distance Learning initiative on other
libraries is mixed. Some librarians and library trustees
have participated in successful sessions and have
experienced the opportunity to participate in a program that
they might not have otherwise attended or have saved
travel time and expense. Others have experienced little but
failure and frustration.

Rather than ending this section on a negative note, the
consultants believe that two other encouraging areas should
be mentioned. The first is that the distance learning system
has been used to a certain extent for meeting purposes.
This is an appropriate use of the technology and initial
reports indicate that this type of use works and that it is
growing. The use of DL technology can be a tool to gain
statewide participation in committees, task forces, boards,
and so forth. DL technology can afford staff in small
libraries a voice in state level decisions that impact all
libraries.

A second expanding area relates to use of the DL system to deliver other types of content. Greater involvement and compatibility with the Indiana Higher Education Telecommunications Services (IHETS) system should be a real plus in the future. Efforts underway to secure additional content from organizations such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Indianapolis Zoo may also expand the use of the DL system to include more end-users.

Literacy

The literacy component of Indiana's LSTA program has several components. One component involves support and liaison functions between the Indiana State Library and local and statewide literacy organizations. The second component involves direct literacy grants provided to institutional libraries. This second part of the program is the focus of the following program review.

The institutional literacy grant program is a modest one. In recent years, a total of approximately $ 50,000 per year has been designated for this purpose. While 41 institutions are eligible for the program, somewhere between twenty and thirty libraries apply for grants each year. Institutions applying range from juvenile correctional facilities to a psychiatric hospital and from a residential school for the blind to a women's prison.

With very few exceptions, the institutional libraries served are very small and have skeletal staffing. In some cases, the individual serving as the "librarian" doubles as a teacher. Individuals involved in planning and implementing grants include rehabilitation specialists, literacy tutors, and teachers as well as librarians and media specialists.

Most of the institutional libraries have minimal resources and collections. Many function with little or no budget for new library resources. Collections often consist of donated materials, discards from other libraries, and materials acquired through LSTA and other grant programs. The materials and software purchased with LSTA funds sometimes represent the basic tools used to carry out literacy efforts in these institutions.

**Has the addition of new books and technology in the
institutional libraries increased library usage?**

There is a significant amount of anecdotal evidence that
suggests that institutional library use has increased due to
the resources acquired through LSTA. Several institutional
librarians who were interviewed in the course of
conducting the evaluation related stories that indicated that
specific series of materials and high-interest/low
vocabulary resources are popular with institutional
residents.

Several grant evaluations document some growth in library
use related to materials and resources purchased with
grants. Included are such things as an increased rate of
completion of assigned "book reports" and improved
performance on tests built into computer-based literacy
software.

**Has the receipt of grant money made a change in the
lives of the librarians or of the residents of the
institutions?**

Although the number of dollars directed to this program is
meager, the impact on individuals is high. One institutional
librarian shared a story of an individual who read their first
complete book as a result of gaining access to appropriate
materials supplied through LSTA funding. Another told of
several young women using their library who commented
that they had never used a library before because they
thought there was "nothing for them."

LSTA funds have also made a difference for the librarians
and other professionals who work with literacy programs in
the institutions. In many cases, the LSTA grants are
supplying the only materials and resources specifically
designed for use with individuals with limited reading
skills. LSTA has also enabled several institutions to
become more active in computer literacy activities.
Computer access, and particularly Internet access, is very
limited or non-existent in many of the institutions
(particularly in correctional facilities). LSTA funds have
been used to purchase computers and appropriate
multimedia software in several instances.

One final benefit of the LSTA institutional literacy grant program has been the opportunity to involve institutional librarians on the "Special Services Committee." This mechanism has afforded many institutional librarians with one of the few opportunities they get to interact with their colleagues from other institutions. This interaction is positive both from the developmental perspective as well as from the viewpoint of gaining first-hand information on the needs of institutional libraries.

What impact have the new materials had on the literacy programs within the institutions?

LSTA funds have had a significant impact on literacy programs in the institutions since materials purchased with grants are often the primary resources that are being used. The literacy grant program has a high impact especially when compared to the small investment of dollars that is made.

Unfortunately, the LSTA funding merely scratches the surface in regard to the needs that exist. Institutional support for literacy from within the parent organizations is dismal. The LSTA literacy grant program can be fairly compared to a modest relief effort in a region beset by famine and disease. Clearly the aid is needed and serves a noble purpose. Some individuals are being helped in a profound way. Unfortunately, many more individuals are not being reached.

How are literacy programs being promoted?

Most of the promotion of literacy programs in the institutions is accomplished in one of two ways. The first is simply one on one contact in which the librarian quietly shares information about the availability of a literacy program to an individual in need of assistance. The second vehicle for promotion is through professional referrals. Teachers or rehabilitation staff may determine that literacy training or computer literacy training would be beneficial to one of their students or clients and alerts the individual to the availability of a program. In many other instances, literacy training is simply a component that is built into the larger educational goals and strategies of the institution.

In most cases, the institutions lack the staff and material resources to handle much more than they're already taking on. The consultants found no evidence to suggest that there was any lack of potential consumers of literacy training services.

APPENDIX A

Indiana LSTA Evaluation
Focus Group Summary

Background

Focus groups held in locations throughout the State of Indiana were used as one of the methods to secure participation from a broad spectrum of the state's library community. It was determined that scheduling a focus group session in one location in each of Indiana's ten Congressional districts would achieve this goal since districts reflect population distribution.

During the week of April 23rd, 2001 focus group discussions were held in Clarksville, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Indianapolis, Kokomo, Merrillville, New Castle, Rensselaer, South Bend, and Terre Haute. Eighty-two (82) individuals took part in these sessions. The questions used in the focus groups are included at the end of this summary.

Involvement in LSTA

Approximately ninety percent (90%) of focus group participants indicated that they had written and/or administered an LSCA or LSTA grant in the past. In addition, several attendees identified involvement with the LSTA program in some other important way. For example, participants included current or past members of ISLAC, the INSPIRE Advisory Committee, and the INCOLSA Board.

Those attending the focus groups were almost all employees of libraries. The single exception was a staff member of a museum that had partnered with a public library on a recent grant. A few of the library staff were relatively new to involvement with the LSTA program. One person indicated that in accepting a new position she had "inherited an LSTA grant from her predecessor." Another individual shared that she was a "new" library director with no experience writing or administering LSTA grants; however, she added that she was aware that, "a lot of the library's computers came from LSTA."

Most Significant Impact of LSTA - Statewide

Focus group participants were asked to identify the specific LSTA-funded or subsidized programs, initiatives, or grant categories that had the most impact since 1997. They were asked to consider this question first on a statewide basis and then from the context of their local library.

The INSPIRE program was the overwhelming choice as the program that had the greatest impact on the State of Indiana as a whole. While it was recognized that INSPIRE has

been funded by a combination of State and Federal dollars, most agreed that the ongoing project either wouldn't have happened or would have been far less successful if LSTA support had not been provided. INSPIRE was characterized as "amazing" and as "leveling the playing field between large and small libraries."

Other LSTA-funded initiatives seen as having a high impact statewide included Internet connectivity, an increased number of computers (and therefore access points to the Internet and INSPIRE), distance learning efforts, and the deployment of integrated library systems (library automation). There was a feeling that LSTA had helped transform libraries by providing access to new technologies. One focus group participant who had recently returned to working in a library after a three year absence said she was "bowled over" by the progress that had been made in that span of time.

There was a single mention of a non-technological change of statewide significance that was attributed to the existence of the LSTA program. Working together on joint initiatives (INSPIRE in particular) "helped build and strengthen the relationships between and among the Indiana State Library (ISL), the Indiana Library Federation (ILF) and The Indiana Cooperative Library Services Authority (INCOLSA). LSTA funding was seen as the glue that held these partners together and helped focus their efforts to the benefit of all.

Most Significant Impact of LSTA - Locally

Focus group participants were also asked to consider which LSTA-funded programs or initiatives had the greatest impact in their local libraries. Again, the INSPIRE project accounted for the lion's share of the responses. One attendee said, "INSPIRE is really big for small libraries!" Several individuals representing larger libraries mentioned that the INSPIRE program saved *their* libraries a significant amount of money. One person quantified this amount at $ 50,000 per year. Another said INSPIRE saves money several ways:

1) Group licensing makes the databases more affordable,
2) state funding of the licenses allows our local budget to be spent on acquiring other print and electronic resources, and,
3) having the full-text periodical resources online saves money because the print materials don't have to be stored in our crowded buildings.

Several people mentioned the importance of LSTA funding for the training and public awareness aspects of the INSPIRE project. Past efforts were generally seen as both high in quality and effective; however, most felt that more work was needed on both counts. One person said, "INSPIRE is a well kept secret in the schools." Another agreed saying, "Some of the kids know about it (INSPIRE), but most of the teachers don't have a clue."

Many of those attending the focus groups stressed the importance of the improved connectivity that has taken place with funding from a variety of sources including LSTA. In addition to high-speed dedicated connections, several mentioned the role that local

area networks and servers purchased with LSTA grant dollars have played in making Internet access a reality in Indiana libraries. One person pointed out that public access to INSPIRE would be greatly limited if libraries weren't able to provide public access computers. Another added that "Internet access brings lots of new people into the library… especially young people."

Other focus group participants indicated that library automation had the most significant impact on their libraries. Several suggested that they still wouldn't have an automation system if LSTA funds hadn't been available to help.

Technology training and the opportunity to try new things were also mentioned as benefits of LSTA funding at the local level. Training, sometimes identified specifically as "INCOLSA" training, was praised for its relevance and quality. While there were many complaints about the small size of grants in the "innovative" category, many of the focus group participants' libraries had applied for and received such grants. Examples of grants in this category included experimentation with the Linux operating system and with wireless networks.

A few participants mentioned benefits that went beyond the products or services that were purchased with LSTA dollars. One person commented that "LSTA helps us bring our boards along on technology." This individual indicated that her library board is slow to embrace new technologies and that the availability of Federal grants allows her library to demonstrate the effectiveness of a technology before expending a large amount of local money. Another said, "The availability of LSTA funds helps us leverage funds from other sources." Getting a grant was seen as lending credibility to a project that could then be expanded or continued using funds from local governments, foundations, and other sources. A single focus group attendee said that LSTA had provided her library with an opportunity to partner with another organization in her community.

What Wouldn't Have Happened Without LSTA?
What Would Have Been Delayed?

A good number of focus group participants said that the INSPIRE project would have been very different (and far less effective) if it had depended solely on the State funds that were provided. One person suggested that the expenditure of State funds would have been "a waste of money without the training and PR." A few said that they doubted that INSPIRE would have happened at all without the availability of LSTA support.

Many other focus group attendees pointed to a variety of technological areas as being those that would have suffered if LSTA funding had not been available. Some of the comments heard included:
  "We still wouldn't have a LAN."
  "We would have far fewer computers."
  "We'd still have dial access Internet."
  "We wouldn't be automated at all."

"It got us over the hump in automation."
"LSTA started us thinking about digitization."

Other comments were more general but perhaps, even more significant. One person characterized the LSTA grant program as "the carrot that encourages us to think about possibilities." Another said that LSTA along with the e-rate program, "pushed us to do the technology planning we needed to do." A final focus group attendee summed it up nicely when she said, "LSTA lifted us from the pit of the digital divide."

Criticisms

Focus group participants were offered the opportunity to express their criticisms of Indiana's implementation of the LSTA program. Many were careful to preface their negative comments with overall praise for the program such as, "The State Library has been most fair." "They (the State Library) make sure everybody gets a piece of the pie." Nevertheless, a number of critical themes did emerge.

Most of the themes correspond to comments heard in the individual interviews that were conducted. They are:

- The grant process timeline
- The small amount of individual competitive grants
- The payment/reimbursement process

Other negative comments related to reporting requirements, the difficulty of meeting requirements for partnering and collaboration on some grants, the process for sharing information about innovative grants with all libraries, and the overall inadequacy of LSTA funds to meet the challenges facing libraries.

Some of the complaints about the grant process timeline were about the length of time between when guidelines for competitive grants were released and the date when grant applications were due. Comments such as, "We need more advance warning…" and, "It's too close to the deadline when we find out exactly what we can and can't ask for." This was seen as an especially important concern in light of the small size of innovative grants. Focus group participants indicated that most innovative projects involve funding from several sources and that they need to know what components will require alternative funding. Other comments related to the time available to carry out approved grants. Many felt that they were left with far less than a year to implement a grant.

Many mentioned the small size of competitive grants. Some indicated that a grant of $ 5,000 might not be worth the effort when the time spent writing the grant, managing the grant, and reporting on the grant were considered. Others indicated that a library can't be very innovative for $ 5,000 and that truly innovative projects that might impact lots of libraries might be very expensive. Some said they'd rather see a large library get a large grant to experiment with a technology on a large scale (wireless networks were

specifically mentioned) if the results (either positive or negative) were widely available. One person suggested that non-competitive mini-grants could be offered to libraries as a follow-up to successful demonstrations.

Focus group participants echoed interviewees in their dislike of the current "pay now and get reimbursed later" process. Some felt that the current process actually discouraged some libraries from applying for grants. A review of this process to determine if an alternative method of payment could be developed was suggested.

Some libraries indicated that the reporting process was burdensome. While the streamlining of the application process was praised, several participants said they had, "no time to do the paperwork." Some suggested that a simple "no report at this time" report was appropriate in some instances. One person suggested that only one report at the end of the project should be required. Those attending the focus groups didn't seem to mind follow-up by the State Library on the progress of a grant. In fact, they indicated a desire for more contact with ISL staff during the implementation of grants. One person suggested that quarterly phone calls about grant progress would be an alternative to periodic written reports.

Requirements for partnering and collaboration also came under fire. While participants were supportive of collaboration, some indicated that there were limited appropriate partners in some areas of the State and that the partnering requirements resulted in "artificial" alliances in other instances. A modification of requirements rather than a wholesale elimination of the requirement seemed to be acceptable to most.

Several people said that Indiana needs to find a better way to share information about successful projects. Most acknowledged that featuring such projects in programs at the ILF Conference was a good idea, but many said that this was insufficient and that finding additional ways of informing the library community of both successes and failures was desirable. Postings to listservs and a page on the State Library's web-site were specific suggestions that were offered.

One person suggested that the process for setting LSTA goals needs to be more open and recommended that ISLAC hold an annual open hearing to gather ideas from the library community. Another person suggested that "big libraries get big grants…" however, this opinion was quickly refuted by another person who pointed out caps on grants and said, "large libraries get far less per capita than small libraries."

In spite of the lively discussions about criticisms that took place at the focus groups, participants in several focus groups agreed that the main problem is that "there isn't enough money to go around." One person said, "Technology is expensive… our needs have grown, but the pot of money hasn't."

Current Priorities

The participants in the focus groups were asked to comment on the appropriateness and relevance of the LSTA Plan's priorities. The response to this question was almost entirely positive. Typical comments included, "INSPIRE was just the right program at just the right time…" and, "The emphasis on technology is right… we need to keep looking forward."

A few people expressed concern over the fact that literacy projects, although specifically mentioned in the LSTA Plan's goals, receives a relatively small amount of the total LSTA funding. While most seemed to be comfortable with the focus on the literacy needs of residents of institutions, others felt that literacy programs in public library based literacy efforts should receive more attention.

There was some discussion in several of the groups regarding the relative proportion of LSTA dollars that go into statewide initiatives and services through the State Library and the amount available for competitive grants. Most seemed to feel that the current mix was just about right. Others indicated that they wished that far more could be apportioned to grants to individual libraries but went on to say that they wouldn't want to see dollars for these grants coming from the statewide initiatives that are being funded at the present time.

Many people expressed their support for increased funding for the INSPIRE program. Most said that training for end users (especially teachers and students) and public awareness efforts should receive increased attention; however, some also felt that LSTA dollars should be used to expand the number of online databases that are available through the program. Overall, the consensus seemed to be that funding for licensing should be limited to State dollars and that LSTA money should continue to be used for support, training and public awareness.

A number of participants raised the question of funding for "upgrades." There was a fear that local funds would be insufficient to enable libraries to maintain the gains they have made in technology in recent years. Others disagreed and stressed the importance of LSTA as experimental/developmental capital. Digitization and distance learning initiatives were seen as the right priorities by many of these individuals. One person who agreed with this assessment said, "If anything, innovation should be a *higher* priority."

Future Priorities

When asked to think about future priorities for LSTA, most focus group attendees concentrated on the expansion or extension of current goals rather than on totally new ideas. Participants wanted more technology training and the regional delivery of training both for library staff and for end users. They called for larger innovative grants; for big projects that other libraries could replicate. One person described a model in which

successful large-scale innovation grants would be transformed into a mini-grant program through which individual libraries could replicate the success of the original innovator.

Several attendees noted that the Indiana State Library Development Office is "understaffed and overworked" and expressed their support for expending LSTA dollars on expert consulting assistance, especially in the areas of technology and youth services. A few focus group participants looked backward and bemoaned the loss of certain categories of funding that were common under LS<u>C</u>A. Several called for renewed funding for construction. Another said that her top priority for the future would be "anything that *isn't* technology." Others indicated that they wished that greater emphasis could be placed on services to the unserved and/or underserved. Several participants in one focus group indicated that a special grant category was needed to address library services to Indiana's growing Hispanic population.

Several focus group participants also made some suggestions for structural changes in the LSTA program. Several supported the idea of allowing multiple year grants. This was seen as particularly appropriate in regard to the large-scale innovative grants mentioned previously.

Finally, many attendees expressed their opinions about Federal mandates and their effect on libraries. A few mentioned the Americans with Disabilities Act and said that their buildings and services were still not completely accessible. Many more mentioned the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) and the filtering issue. Some were concerned that funding for important services would be lost if their libraries refused to offer filtered Internet access. Others indicated that if Congress was going to mandate filters that Congress should fund filters.

Administration of the LSTA Program in Indiana

The most common theme in relation to the Indiana State Library's administration of the LSTA program was an expression of gratitude for simplifying the grant application process. Participants called it "simple and streamlined" and "greatly improved." While some of the criticisms mentioned earlier were again raised, most felt that ISL had put forth a very good effort to make the most of a valued Federal program.

The State Library was praised for their responsible use of State and Federal funds, especially in relation to funding for the INSPIRE program and efforts to improve the telecommunications infrastructure. Most focus group participants thought that ISL had done a wonderful job of coordinating the use of funds to ensure the maximum benefit.

The Indiana State Library staff and the State Librarian were also praised for their willingness to help and the support they've given (especially to small libraries). "Staff is always willing to listen and to help if they can…" was a typical comment.

One area in which the State Library was criticized related to technology standards. A number of people felt that the State Library needed to exercise a stronger role in establishing standards for technology and digitization projects. While some people disagreed with this assessment and felt that flexibility was necessary to deal with local situations, the majority seemed to agree that there was a role for the ISL in using LSTA funds to encourage adherence to specific standards. Several people stressed that it was important to include the library community in determining what the standards should be.

There was considerable support for the exploration of multiple year grants. As one person put it, "Single year grants make you think too small."

APPENDIX B

Indiana LSTA Evaluation
Personal Interview Summary

Personal interviews were conducted with thirty-five (35) representatives of the Indiana library community. Twenty-one (21) of the interviews were held in-person, usually in the library in which the individual was employed. The remaining fourteen (14) interviews were conducted by telephone. All interviews were scheduled in advance and for a time that was convenient for the interviewee. Interviews ranged in duration from about fifteen minutes to nearly an hour in length.

A total of twenty (20) of the interviews involved public library directors or public library staff members. Five (5) of the interviewees worked in institutional libraries. The balance of those interviewed represented academic libraries, school libraries, or support organizations including the Indiana Library Federation (ILF), the Indiana Cooperative Library Services Authority (INCOLSA), and the Indiana State Library (ISL). A number of those interviewed were members of important statewide panels such as the Indiana State Library Advisory Council (ISLAC) and the Indiana Spectrum of Information Resources (INSPIRE) Board.

Libraries of all sizes and in locations throughout Indiana were represented by those interviewed. Directors and/or staff members from libraries as large as the Indianapolis - Marion County Public Library and as small as the Worthington and Bloomfield Public libraries were included. Geographic distribution ranged from Gary to Jeffersonville and from Ft. Wayne to Evanston as well as many points in between. The consultants often took the opportunity of being in a community to briefly tour the library to get a feel for the context within which library services are provided.

The individuals interviewed, nearly without exception, gave the State Library high marks for administration of the Library Services and Technology Act program. Several librarians who had worked in other states made a point of comparing Indiana's implementation of the Act favorably to those they experienced in other places. Time and again, the State Library was complimented for simplifying the grant process, especially the application for competitive grants. State Library staff members were described as responsive, helpful, and as "listening to their constituents." The word "streamlined" was used by several of those interviewed to describe the grant application process. The entire grant process was characterized as "open and fair" and one person offered that the Indiana State Library "runs a good ship."

The relatively few criticisms of the Indiana State Library's administration of LSTA funds generally fell into three categories. The first related to timing of grant cycles. The second had to do with the grant reimbursement process, and the third with the size of the competitive grants that are awarded.

Representatives of both public libraries and institutional libraries indicated that by the time some grants are awarded and claims for reimbursement can be made, libraries often have only eight or nine months to implement a project. Several indicated that the State Library had been flexible in working with libraries to extend projects into the following year, but many felt that grant cycles could be adjusted to allow for a full twelve month implementation period. The timing for literacy grants awarded to institutional libraries seemed to be a particular concern. The grant award process along with internal quarterly purchasing procedures and bidding procedures reportedly leaves some institutional library staff with an almost impossible task of selecting materials and expending funds in a timely manner.

Several representatives of smaller libraries indicated that their local budgets are not set up in a fashion that makes paying first and receiving reimbursement after the fact a simple matter. One librarian reported having to pay up-front for project expenses from library endowment funds because they were not allowed to draw on any established library account for expenses not related to operating budget categories.

A final criticism heard from many people was that the maximum amounts available for literacy and innovation grants are too small (\$ 2,000 and \$ 5,000 respectively). Several larger public libraries indicated that it was hard to justify devoting staff time to writing, administering, and reporting on a grant for such a small sum. Some indicated that even the \$ 10,000 amount that used to be available for the innovation category was too small to attempt anything that was truly innovative. Institutional libraries, while extremely grateful for the \$2,000 literacy grants they had received, acknowledged that this amount barely scratches the surface of their needs. In some institutional libraries, LSTA dollars are the only funds available for the purchase of materials.

Interviewees indicated great satisfaction with the priorities found in the current LSTA long-range plan. Statements such as "the priorities are good," "they're just right," and "it's uncanny, LSTA has provided just what we needed when we needed it" are indicative of the types of comments that were heard. Most felt that Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) and LSTA dollars had been used effectively. Several noted that the funds had first been used to address basic infrastructure and connectivity needs, and that more recently LSTA dollars had been used to support INSPIRE program activities, to increase the number of access points to information (more computers in libraries), and to begin the process of digitizing local resources such as newspaper indexes and public records.

Persons interviewed were asked to comment on what they believed should be future priorities for the LSTA program. A few people bemoaned the loss of the "C" (Construction) in the old Library Services and Construction Act. One person said, "everybody is funding technology but no one is funding buildings anymore." However, most others disagreed and suggested that improving library and information services through the effective use of technology should continue to be the major focus of Indiana's program.

At the same time, a good number of interviewees spoke about what they felt was an appropriate shift that had been happening over the last few years. It was noted that the focus of Indiana's LSTA technology funding had gradually moved from funding infrastructure to funding content. Most supported a continuation off this change and cited specific examples of "Indiana" content worthy of digitization or of database content that they felt should be added to INSPIRE. More than a few suggested that LSTA should be used to license additional databases; however, a majority felt that the State of Indiana was the most appropriate source of ongoing funding for database licensing. Generally, interviewees seemed to believe that the best use of LSTA dollars is for a continuation of INSPIRE support, training, and public awareness efforts. Some thought that limited term demonstrations of new databases using LSTA funds would be appropriate.

Ongoing support for the INSPIRE program was a universal theme. People praised the program as being "enormously helpful," "the great equalizer," and as "opening our eyes to let us see what is possible." One person said, "It (public access to full-text databases) seemed like an impossible dream when we started talking about it, but they (the Indiana State Library working with the Indiana library community) made it happen." Another said, "INSPIRE jump-started Internet use in small public libraries and in school library/media centers."

A number of those interviewed attempted to quantify the monetary value of the program. Several people offered that INSPIRE saves their library at least $ 10,000 per year that can be used to further enrich local resources. One interviewee placed the dollar value of INSPIRE to their library in excess of $ 30,000 per year.

While everyone seemed to agree that INSPIRE should continue, several suggested that the focus of LSTA dollars spent on INSPIRE needs to shift. One said, "INSPIRE was a great idea and was pioneering when we did it but we need to move on." Another offered the opinion that, "We need to take it (INSPIRE) to the next level as far as Indiana content is concerned."

A number of people saw digitization projects as a fitting complement to INSPIRE in that the projects produce content that can be distributed via the World Wide Web. Digitization was also seen as an ideal type of project for grant funding since most of the costs are one-time expenses.

One person felt that a greater effort should be made to coordinate digitization on a statewide basis. Two specific improvements were suggested. First, that a committee or task force should be given the task of identifying resources that should have priority for digitization. Second, that specific standards should be established to ensure that the digitized resources are readily accessible.

Public awareness and training were also mentioned as priorities for future LSTA support for INSPIRE. One librarian said, "INSPIRE is a great program but we haven't convinced the public yet." Several other interviewees indicated that in their libraries, staff members, rather than the public, were still the primary users of INSPIRE. People were generally

positive about the public awareness efforts that have been made but one person interviewed noted that "…the amount spent on public relations for INSPIRE seems to be a lot to libraries but it's a pittance for a statewide publicity campaign." However, another interviewee noted that, "you could easily spend more on publicizing the program than you spend on licensing the databases… it's hard to figure out the right level."

Many of those interviewed expressed the opinion that training people to use INSPIRE should be a priority for LSTA funding. However, there was little agreement on who should be targeted for training. Training targeting library staff, teachers, students, and the general public all received some support.

Distance learning initiatives were also mentioned as a future priority, although support for this program was not nearly as widespread as support for INSPIRE. Most perceived Indiana's foray into distance learning technology as a noble experiment that hasn't yet produced the desired results. Distance learning was characterized as "a good idea," and as having great potential to "save time and money." At the same time, certain shortcomings were noted. For example, it was not seen as a reasonable replacement for hands-on computer training. Nevertheless, it was seen as a tool to provide greater continuing education opportunities.

While the benefits of distance education as a means of delivering training for library staff were most prominently referred to, three individuals also talked about using the technology to deliver programming content. Efforts with the Indianapolis Zoo were specifically mentioned.

Even those most supportive of the distance learning initiatives indicated that, thus far, the program had been fraught with technical problems and had been unreliable. However, several people expressed the opinion that good things were about to happen. One said, "We're still at least a year away from success, but we're beginning to see signs that it will pay off." Another felt that more rapid progress was being made and offered that, "we're on the edge of having it (use of the distance learning system) explode." Overall, most seemed to believe that distance learning should continue to be a priority.

The small size of innovative grants was raised again in relation to future priorities. Several of those interviewed mentioned specific areas in which experimentation might benefit all libraries in the State. Included were "virtual reference" projects and "wireless network" applications. It was felt that true innovation usually requires venture capital well beyond the $ 5,000 grant amount.

One person suggested that innovation grants need to be "scaled" if they are going to meet the needs of libraries of all sizes. An example was given of the difference in cost of introducing a new service in a small community versus introducing the same service in a large community. It was reasoned that since an adequate implementation of a program serving a larger number of people typically requires more materials, equipment, or staff, that grants designed to reach larger populations should have a higher cap as well.

One interviewee also expressed a concern that attempts to share the results of innovative projects have been meager. They believed that the primary focus of innovative grants should be gaining knowledge about a technology or about an approach to delivering library and information services that can be replicated by others.

The consultants noted some confusion among those interviewed concerning which initiatives have been funded by the State of Indiana and which have received LSTA support. In particular, some ascribed credit for the licensing of most INSPIRE databases and for "T-1" line connectivity to LSTA funding. However, those who did have a clear picture of how certain initiatives were supported praised the State Library for what they perceived as an excellent job of using Federal funds to complement State-funded programs. One example cited was the use of LSTA dollars to improve local and wide-area networks (LANs and WANs) in concert with e-rate discounts and State-funded upgrades in telecommunication connectivity (56K and T-1 lines). Another example given was the use of LSTA dollars to support interface development, training, public awareness, and technical support for the online database licenses purchased with State funds.

Interview participants were not in complete agreement about the appropriate balance between spending for statewide initiatives and for competitive grants. However, even among those who wanted a larger percentage of LSTA funds to be directed toward competitive grants, comments to this effect were usually prefaced with unqualified support for the use of LSTA funds to support activities related to the INSPIRE project. One representatives from a large libraries who characterized INSPIRE's impact on larger libraries as "marginal," said, "it (supporting INSPIRE) was the right thing to do." Another said, "The State Library did the INSPIRE project very well."

Those who supported making more money available for competitive grants offered a number of reasons for their advocacy for this position. One suggested that more competitive grant categories would allow for proposals that are "more relevant to local concerns." Another said that competitive grants allow local libraries to "explore new opportunities" and "demonstrate what they can do" for their local residents. Yet another interviewee said that the availability of LSTA grants for a particular purpose gives the library credibility in seeking funds from other sources to expand or enhance a project. Several indicated that they were usually able to continue a successful program once it's usefulness was demonstrated.

Some people suggested specific new grant categories such as "incentives for libraries to form larger units of service" and "bread and butter" grants to help libraries stay current in their technological offerings. In fact, he funding of "upgrades" in technology was mentioned frequently. However, most of those interviewed thought that the current balance between statewide projects and competitive grants was about right. There was also a minority who felt that competitive grants should be reduced or even eliminated in favor of statewide initiatives.

Some interview participants indicated that they were unaware of the total amount of

LSTA support received by the State and that, consequently, they didn't have a clear picture of how the funds were divided. Most seemed to be aware that LSTA funds had been used to pay for INSPIRE related positions at INCOLSA but only two individuals mentioned LSTA support for positions at the State Library.

It is unclear how the Indiana library community perceives LSTA funding for library development related positions at the State Library. However, it is clear that few think the State Library is overstaffed. Several people offered the opinion that the State Library was understaffed. Others characterized the State Library staff as overworked and over-extended.

Mention of the concept of "partnering" elicited a broad range of comments. One library director said, "the partnering aspect of LSTA is key… the most important thing LSTA does is break down walls." A staff member from another library that had received an innovative grant characterized one of the most important outcomes of the project as "forming new partnerships and strengthening old ones." However, others disagreed with the assessment that partnering requirements were useful. Several said that finding suitable partners was difficult in the more remote areas of the state. Most were not opposed to partnering as a concept, nevertheless, several urged reconsideration of current guidelines to allow for greater flexibility.

Interview subjects were also asked to comment on the most significant results that had come about because of LSTA funding. One said, "LSTA has helped the library become recognized as a technology leader in the community. Another offered that, "Our (innovative) project provided the library with greater visibility." Still others felt that the technology emphasis of LSTA had resulted in "the public beginning to see the library in a different way."

APPENDIX C

Indiana LSTA Evaluation
Web Survey Summary

Following the focus group sessions the consultants posted a web-survey, which the Indiana State Library (ISL) made known through postings to Internet listservs frequented by members of the Indiana library community and through a link on the ISL Library Development Office's web page. The primary purpose of the survey was to explore issues raised by focus group or interview participants. Most of the survey questions were designed to measure the intensity of opinions and to gauge the level of support of the participants on a number of programs and issues.

Limitations of the Web Survey

Since participation was open to anyone who, having learned of the web-site, chose to complete the survey, the responses do not represent a scientific sampling of the Indiana library community. Therefore, survey results cannot be generalized to all Indiana libraries. Furthermore, it should be noted that it is likely that multiple people from some libraries or organizations responded to the survey. Therefore, the number of responses for a type of library does not necessarily represent the same number of libraries.

Nevertheless, the web survey results are valuable in that they provide another dimension in the array of data gathering techniques used and provide additional insight into how the Indiana library community perceives the Indiana State Library's LSTA program. The survey results are best used in combination with information gathered from other sources such as the focus groups and/or interviews. The web survey serves as a mechanism that can be used to confirm or refute statements made by individuals, and to assess the strength of opinions and ideas expressed by those who participated in the interviews and focus groups.

Who participated?

One hundred and twenty (120) people responded to the survey. Of those, 88 or over seventy-three percent (73.33%) said they represented public libraries; 13 individuals (10.83%) indicated that they represented school libraries/media centers; 8 (6.67%) identified themselves as representing academic libraries; 4 (3.33%) represented institutional libraries; and 7 (5.83%) identified themselves as representing other organizations including a special library, a library network organization, INCOLSA and the ISL itself.

Responses came from people connected with libraries of all sizes: just over five percent (5.04%) were from libraries with less than one full time equivalent (FTE) staff and more than seven percent (7.56%) were from libraries with one FTE. However, overall there were more participants from larger libraries. Nearly thirty percent (29.41%) of the

responses came from people connected with libraries having more than twenty FTEs and another twenty-two percent (22.69%) said their library had between ten and twenty FTEs. Similarly, a small percentage of respondents (2.59%) said their library's materials budget was between $1,001 and $5,000 while the highest percentage (18.97%) said their materials budget was in the $100,001 to $250,000 range. An additional ten percent (10.34%) had materials budgets ranging from $250,001 to $500,000 and nearly fifteen percent (14.66%) said their materials budget was over $500,000.

What did they say?

The first question asked respondents to rate the importance of a variety of LSTA and State funded programs *to their own libraries or organizations*. They were asked to offer their appraisal of the programs on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing "Very Unimportant" and 5 being "Very Important." The following chart shows the mean and median of the ratings of the programs in descending order. (Mean = average score; Median = midpoint or point at which half of ratings were higher and half were lower.)

The overall pattern of responses is fairly predictable given the statewide scope of INSPIRE and of the significant investment made in providing direct Internet connections. It is clear that these programs have met a widespread need among libraries. The impact of retrospective conversion and automation projects as well as of innovative projects is considerably more local in nature.

Program	Mean Score	Median Score
INSPIRE	4.82	5
Direct Internet Connections	4.55	5
"Other"	4.24	5
Digitization Grants	3.76	4
"Innovative" Projects	3.72	4
Distance Learning Sites	3.68	4
Retrospective Conversion and Automation Projects	3.58	4
Literacy Projects	3.49	4

Nor is it surprising that the "Other" category was ranked highly by individuals who identified a program area different than those specifically mentioned in the survey. It is more likely that people would mention something that they value highly. Thirty-three (33) individuals cited such a program. However, the nature of the programs mentioned is important. Training (often identified as "INCOLSA" training) and technology upgrades were most frequently cited.

It is also significant to note that all programs rated well above the midpoint on the importance scale. A rating of 2.50 would be an indication of indifference. As is shown on the chart above, the lowest rating was almost 3.50 (3.49), well into positive territory.

Survey participants from public libraries rated direct Internet connections even above INSPIRE. Connectivity was identified as being Very Important by eighty-seven percent (87.36%) percent of public library respondents. However, INSPIRE followed closely at nearly eighty-two percent (81.82%). Furthermore, when the "4 - Important " and "5 - Very Important" categories are combined, INSPIRE commands a high approval rating from over ninety-five percent (95.46%) while the same combination yields a rating of just over ninety-three percent (93.11%) for "direct Internet connections." It is clear that both the Internet connections and INSPIRE are greatly valued by members of the public library community.

Among those in school libraries, INSPIRE received a Very Important rating from all but one of the respondents or over ninety-two percent (92.31%). Direct Internet connections received a Very Important rating from over sixty-one percent (61.54%).

INSPIRE received a Very Important rating from all eight (8) of the academic library participants, from all four of the institutional librarians responding, and from six of the seven individuals from other types of libraries or organizations. Given the small numbers of participants from academic, institutional, and other libraries, percents often exaggerate responses in comparison. However, support for the INSPIRE program was again clearly evident. Choices for the second highest rated program were rather widely dispersed among the academic, institutional and "other" groups.

Both public library and school library media responses for the retrospective conversion/automation program were concentrated in the Very Important rating. Almost thirty-four percent (33.72%) of the public library responses and nearly fifty-four percent (53.85%) of the school library media responses were at this level. Academic library ratings were diverse; all of the institutional library responses were at the mid-point of the rating range—neither Unimportant nor Important.

The highest ratings for the digitization grants came from the public library and school library media participants, although the highest percents were at the Important rating rather than the Very Important rating. Over thirty-five percent (35.63%) of the public library responses and half (50.00%) of the school library media responses were rated at the Important level. The relatively high percent of neither Unimportant nor Important ratings for digitization grants and for Innovative projects is perhaps a reflection of the limited number of grant recipients in this program area to date. Also, as was noted earlier, digitization projects have tended to have a local rather than a statewide focus.

Distance learning sites also received mixed responses. The highest concentration of public library responses for this program was one -third (33.33%) at the mid-point of the rating range—neither Unimportant nor Important; however, over fifty-five percent (55.18%) rated distance learning sites as either Very Important or Important. Over eighty-three percent (83.33%) of the school library/media center responses indicated that distance learning sites were either Important or Very Important. This perhaps reflects the growing awareness in the school community of distance education initiatives and opportunities. Almost thirty-eight percent (37.50%), which was the highest concentration

of the academic responses, were for "Unimportant." Half (50.00%) of the small number of institutional library ratings were at the Unimportant level.

The highest ratings for the literacy projects came from the school library media participants, with almost fifty-four percent (53.85%) giving literacy projects a Very Important rating. The highest concentration of ratings from the public library participants for literacy projects was at the Important level. It should also be noted that the highest concentration of Unimportant ratings (Very Unimportant and Unimportant combined) from respondents in the public library community (23.25%) came on this topic.

The next series of questions in the survey were statements with which respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement: Strongly Agree, Agree, No Opinion, Disagree, and, Strongly Disagree. The statements were based on comments and opinions expressed by focus group participants and/or people interviewed during the course of the data gathering stages of the evaluation.

When asked their opinion of the statement, "Big libraries are favored and get more grants," over thirty-nine percent (39.50%), which was the highest percentage, disagreed. Overall, over seventy-one percent (71.43%) either strongly disagreed, disagreed, or indicated no opinion, while nearly twenty-nine percent (28.57%) either agreed or strongly agreed.

Alternatively, to the statement, "Small libraries are favored and get more grants," over sixty percent (60.83%) indicated some level of disagreement. Another thirty-two percent (31.67%) had no opinion while only seven and one-half percent (7.5%) agreed or strongly agreed. If we calculate a mean score on these two questions using Strongly Agree = 1, Agree = 2, No Opinion = 3, Disagree = 4, and Strongly Disagree = 5, the mean score for the first statement, big libraries are favored, is 3.17 while the mean score for the second statement, small libraries are favored, is 3.62. Comparatively, the participants were slightly stronger in their disagreement with the statement that small libraries are favored. However, given that three (3) represents a neutral opinion, it would not appear that favoritism toward big or small libraries is a major issue among the respondents.

The next four statements dealt with INSPIRE. The first statement said, "Most people in Indiana still don't know about INSPIRE." Over eighty percent (80.83%) either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. The mean score for this statement is 2.11. (The lower the mean score on a statement, the higher the level of agreement there is among respondents to the statement.) It is clear that those participating in the survey believe that public awareness of the INSPIRE program is still at a relatively low level.

The second statement said, "LSTA funding for INSPIRE training should be targeted toward teachers." The responses to this statement brought a more perceptible difference of opinions. Forty-five percent (45.0%) overall agreed with the statement, but nearly twenty-six percent (25.83%) disagreed. Over forty-three percent (43.18%) of the public library respondents agreed with the statement while over twenty-seven percent (27.27%) disagreed. Among the school library/media center responses, over forty-six percent

(46.15%) agreed with the statement, while more than twenty-three percent (23.08%) disagreed. Among the limited number of academic library responses, seventy-five percent (75.00%) agreed and the remaining twenty-five percent (25.00%) had no opinion. None of the academic library representatives disagreed with this statement.

If the strongly agree and agree categories are combined, almost seventy-seven percent (76.92%) of the school library media participants indicated some level of agreement with this statement; there were no "no-opinions." The public library respondents, while still somewhat supportive of the idea, indicated a lower level of agreement. Exactly half (50.00%) of the responses from public libraries fell into the strongly agree or agree categories. The overall mean score for this statement from all types of libraries was 2.68.

The third statement said, LSTA funding for INSPIRE training should be targeted toward library media center staff. Almost sixty-nine percent (68.91%) of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Over sixty-five percent (65.51%) of the public library responses fell into either the agree or strongly agree categories. However, over ninety-two percent (92.31%) of the school library/media center responses were either agree or strongly agree. The mean score for this statement was 2.32.

The last statement concerning INSPIRE said LSTA funding for INSPIRE training should target the public. Two-thirds (66.67%) of all respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement and the two categories combined produced over seventy-one percent (71.60%) support from public librarians. The school library media responses for the combined categories produced support from slightly over half (53.85%). However, it is interesting to note that school library/media center representatives had the highest percentage of strongly agree responses from any type of library. Fifty percent of the academic responses agreed or strongly agreed. The mean score for this statement was 2.37.

Among the four statements related to the INSPIRE program, the highest level of agreement was for the statement, most people don't know about INSPIRE. The least agreement was for the statement, LSTA funding for INSPIRE training should target teachers. There was more agreement that LSTA funding for INSPIRE should be targeted toward library/media center staff than for similarly funded training for the general public.

Opinions on targeting literacy grants either to institutional libraries or to individual libraries seem to be relatively weak. Both statements regarding targeting of LSTA literacy funds met with a "no opinion" response from nearly a third of respondents. Furthermore, very few responses on either question fell into the strongly agree or strongly disagree category.

The statement that "LSTA funding for literacy projects should be targeted toward individuals in institutional settings," garnered a "no opinion" response from over thirty-one percent (31.36%). The combined percentage for strongly agree and strongly disagree totaled just over thirty percent (30.51%) and the combined percentage for disagree and strongly disagree added up to in excess of thirty-eight percent (38.14%). Responses from

school library/media center representatives was much more supportive of targeting literacy programs to residents of institutions (76.92% selected either strongly agree or agree). Surprisingly, all four institutional librarians that participated in the survey selected the "no opinion" response. The mean score for this statement was 3.13.

More participants had an opinion on the statement, "LSTA funding for literacy projects should be targeted toward individual libraries." Overall, fifty-five percent (55.00%) agreed with this statement (combined agree and strongly agree categories).

Almost fifty-seven percent (56.82%) of the public library responses were either agree or strongly agree for this statement. A similar proportion, almost fifty-four percent (53.84%), of the school library media responses were either agree or strongly agree. While none of the academic library respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, 62 percent of the academic responses on this statement were no opinion. The mean score for this statement was 2.50.

The statement that garnered the highest level of agreement (a mean score of 1.41) of all the statements was LSTA and State Funding for INSPIRE has helped libraries of all types and sizes. Ninety-two percent of the responses were either strongly agree or agree for this statement. Strongly agree was the most frequent response to this statement from all types of libraries. It is evident that a significant percentage of the entire Indiana library community sees INSPIRE as a program that has had a great impact on library service in recent years.

The next several statements addressed comments that had been made about the processes and requirements of the grant process in Indiana. To the statement, "The process of applying for LSTA grants is too complicated and time-consuming," the overall response was disagree. Over thirty-eight percent (38.60%) disagreed and an additional eighteen percent (18.42%) strongly disagreed. However, one might look at over a quarter of the responses (25.44%) from those who agreed (either agree or strongly agree) with the statement as being too high. While twenty-five percent of the public library representatives agreed that the process is too complicated, over thirty-eight percent of the school library/media center representatives perceived the process as difficult. Given that the consultants heard from many people in focus groups that the process has been greatly simplified, it is possible that some of the school librarians are either unfamiliar with the process or have not been involved in it recently. The mean score for this statement was 3.46.

Indiana's process of having libraries pay for grant activities first and filing for reimbursement afterward was characterized as burdensome by a number of participants in the focus groups and interviews. In the survey, over forty-three percent (43.69%) either agreed or strongly agreed that the reimbursement process was burdensome. The mean score for this statement was 2.78.

The next statement said, "Evidence of partnerships with other libraries should be a requirement for applying for grants." Over seventy-three percent of the survey respondents disagreed with the statement (combined disagree and strongly disagree). All

of the institutional library respondents indicated agreement with the statement, as did a relatively few number of individuals from other types of libraries. However, partnering seems to be an issue with many, if not most in the Indiana library community. The mean score for this statement was 3.84.

Over fifty-nine percent (59.17%) of the survey respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the next statement that said, "Reporting requirements discourage my library from applying for LSTA grants." A fairly high percent of the responses from each type of library had no opinion on this statement, generally an indication that it is not an issue. The mean score for this statement was 3.57.

Travel time to training and educational experiences is sometimes a major concern. The next question asked how long in travel time the respondents were willing to travel for a typical half-day technology training event. The highest percent of responses overall (47.46%) was for the choice "between thirty and sixty minutes." This was true for respondents from all types of libraries except those from institutional libraries, who were willing to travel more than 2 hours. However, it is important to remember that the institutional response is from a very small number of individuals. The second highest percent of responses overall (33.05%) was for "one to one and a half hours."

The answers were similar concerning the statement how long librarians are willing to travel for a typical half-day training event NOT related to technology. The highest percent of responses overall (44.74%) was again "between thirty and sixty minutes" followed by "one to one and a half hours" which received over thirty-four percent (34.21%) of the total.

Survey respondents were also asked to state their priorities for Indiana's LSTA program in the future. A complete list of the first, second, and third priorities as stated by survey respondents is contained in the document entitled "Indiana Web Survey - Future Priorities and Comments." It is very interesting to note how closely the future priorities for LSTA align with current priorities and program categories. Continued support for the INSPIRE program is clearly important. In addition, digitization efforts appear to be high on the list of many Indiana librarians as well.

Literacy initiatives, innovative projects, general technology projects and training are also prominently mentioned as is distance education. It is also obvious from a casual review of the list of priorities that real concerns continue to exist regarding basic connectivity and the ability of libraries to keep up with needed hardware and software upgrades. The words "upgrade"and "maintenance" appear often. It also appears that many libraries are eager to explore wireless networks.

Those who responded to the survey were also given the opportunity to offer any additional general comments about Indiana's LSTA program. These comments can be found in the "General Comments" section of the "Indiana Web Survey - Future Priorities and Comments" document.

Appendix C - Indiana LSTA Evaluation - Web Survey Summary

	All Library Response	All Library Percentages	Public Library Response	Public Library Percentages	School Library Response	School Library Percentages	Academic Library Response	Academic Library Percentages	Institutional Library Response	Institutional Library Percentages	Other Library Response	Other Library Percentages
Q.1. Rating of Importance of Various LSTA Programs/Services												
Direct Internet Connections												
1 Very Unimportant	3	2.52%	0	0.00%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	3	2.52%	2	2.30%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
3	11	9.24%	4	4.60%	0	0.00%	4	50.00%	2	50.00%	1	14.29%
4	10	8.40%	5	5.75%	3	23.08%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
5 Very Important	92	77.31%	76	87.36%	8	61.54%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	6	85.71%
Mean =	**4.55**											
Median =	**5.00**											
INSPIRE												
1 Very Unimportant	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	4	3.33%	4	4.55%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4	14	11.67%	12	13.64%	1	7.69%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
5 Very Important	102	85.00%	72	81.82%	12	92.31%	8	100.00%	4	100.00%	6	85.71%
Mean =	**4.82**											
Median =	**5.00**											
Digitization Grants												
1 Very Unimportant	2	1.71%	2	2.30%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	11	9.40%	6	6.90%	1	8.33%	2	25.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%
3	31	26.50%	25	28.74%	2	16.67%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%
4	42	35.90%	31	35.63%	6	50.00%	2	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	16.67%
5 Very Important	31	26.50%	23	26.44%	3	25.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	3	50.00%
Mean =	**3.76**											
Median =	**4.00**											
Distance Learning Sites												
1 Very Unimportant	5	4.24%	4	4.60%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	13	11.02%	6	6.90%	1	8.33%	3	37.50%	2	50.00%	1	14.29%
3	33	27.97%	29	33.33%	1	8.33%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
4	31	26.27%	22	25.29%	4	33.33%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	3	42.86%
5 Very Important	36	30.51%	26	29.89%	6	50.00%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	2	28.57%
Mean =	**3.68**											
Median =	**4.00**											

Appendix C - Indiana LSTA Evaluation - Web Survey Summary

	All Library Response	All Library Percentages	Public Library Response	Public Library Percentages	School Library Response	School Library Percentages	Academic Library Response	Academic Library Percentages	Institutional Library Response	Institutional Library Percentages	Other Library Response	Other Library Percentages
Retrospective Conversion/Automation												
1 Very Unimportant	14	11.86%	12	13.95%	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	12	10.17%	9	10.47%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	26	22.03%	17	19.77%	2	15.38%	2	25.00%	4	100.00%	1	14.29%
4	23	19.49%	19	22.09%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
5 Very Important	43	36.44%	29	33.72%	7	53.85%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	5	71.43%
Mean =	**3.58**											
Median =	**4.00**											
Innovative Projects												
1 Very Unimportant	1	0.83%	1	1.14%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	14	11.67%	9	10.23%	3	23.08%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
3	31	25.83%	22	25.00%	3	23.08%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	4	57.14%
4	46	38.33%	37	42.05%	4	30.77%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	3	42.86%
5 Very Important	28	23.33%	19	21.59%	3	23.08%	4	50.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	**3.72**											
Median =	**4.00**											
Literacy Projects												
1 Very Unimportant	7	5.93%	5	5.81%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	1	14.29%
2	20	16.95%	15	17.44%	1	7.69%	1	12.50%	2	50.00%	1	14.29%
3	28	23.73%	19	22.09%	2	15.38%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	3	42.86%
4	34	28.81%	27	31.40%	3	23.08%	2	25.00%	1	25.00%	1	14.29%
5 Very Important	29	24.58%	20	23.26%	7	53.85%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
Mean =	**3.49**											
Median =	**4.00**											
Other												
1 Very Unimportant	1	3.03%	1	5.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2	4	12.12%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3	2	6.06%	1	5.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	33.33%
4	5	15.15%	5	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
5 Very Important	21	63.64%	13	65.00%	2	50.00%	2	50.00%	2	100.00%	2	66.67%
Mean =	**4.24**											
Median =	**5.00**											

Appendix C - Indiana LSTA Evaluation - Web Survey Summary

	All Library Response	All Library Percentages	Public Library Response	Public Library Percentages	School Library Response	School Library Percentages	Academic Library Response	Academic Library Percentages	Institutional Library Response	Institutional Library Percentages	Other Library Response	Other Library Percentages
Q.2. Big libraries are favored												
Strongly Agree	5	4.20%	5	5.68%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Agree	29	24.37%	22	25.00%	1	7.69%	1	12.50%	4	100.00%	1	16.67%
No Opinion	32	26.89%	22	25.00%	5	38.46%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	3	50.00%
Disagree	47	39.50%	36	40.91%	7	53.85%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%
Strongly Disagree	6	5.04%	3	3.41%	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%
Mean =	**3.17**											
Median =	**3.00**											
Q.3. Small libraries are favored												
Strongly Agree	2	1.67%	1	1.14%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
Agree	7	5.83%	5	5.68%	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No Opinion	38	31.67%	26	29.55%	6	46.15%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	3	42.86%
Disagree	61	50.83%	45	51.14%	7	53.85%	3	37.50%	3	75.00%	3	42.86%
Strongly Disagree	12	10.00%	11	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
Mean =	**3.62**											
Median =	**4.00**											
Q.4. Most people don't know about INSPIRE												
Strongly Agree	22	18.33%	14	15.91%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	2	50.00%	3	42.86%
Agree	75	62.50%	56	63.64%	11	84.62%	5	62.50%	0	0.00%	3	42.86%
No Opinion	11	9.17%	6	6.82%	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	14.29%
Disagree	12	10.00%	12	13.64%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	**2.11**											
Median =	**2.00**											
Q.5. INSPIRE training should target teachers												
Strongly Agree	13	10.83%	6	6.82%	4	30.77%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	2	28.57%
Agree	54	45.00%	38	43.18%	6	46.15%	6	75.00%	1	25.00%	3	42.86%
No Opinion	17	14.17%	15	17.05%	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Disagree	31	25.83%	24	27.27%	3	23.08%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%	2	28.57%
Strongly Disagree	5	4.17%	5	5.68%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	**2.68**											
Median =	**2.00**											

Appendix C - Indiana LSTA Evaluation - Web Survey Summary

	All Library Response	All Library Percentages	Public Library Response	Public Library Percentages	School Library Response	School Library Percentages	Academic Library Response	Academic Library Percentages	Institutional Library Response	Institutional Library Percentages	Other Library Response	Other Library Percentages
Q.6. INSPIRE training should target library/media center staff												
Strongly Agree	19	15.97%	11	12.64%	5	38.46%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	2	28.57%
Agree	63	52.94%	46	52.87%	7	53.85%	5	62.50%	1	25.00%	4	57.14%
No Opinion	18	15.13%	17	19.54%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Disagree	19	15.97%	13	14.94%	1	7.69%	2	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	14.29%
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	**2.31**											
Median =	**2.00**											
Q.7. INSPIRE training should target the public												
Strongly Agree	23	19.17%	15	17.05%	4	30.77%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	2	28.57%
Agree	57	47.50%	48	54.55%	3	23.08%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	3	42.86%
No Opinion	18	15.00%	13	14.77%	3	23.08%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	1	14.29%
Disagree	17	14.17%	11	12.50%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	2	50.00%	1	14.29%
Strongly Disagree	5	4.17%	1	1.14%	1	7.69%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	**2.37**											
Median =	**2.00**											
Q.8. Funds for literacy should target institutions												
Strongly Agree	4	3.39%	2	2.27%	2	15.38%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Agree	32	27.12%	21	23.86%	8	61.54%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
No Opinion	37	31.36%	26	29.55%	1	7.69%	5	62.50%	4	100.00%	1	20.00%
Disagree	36	30.51%	31	35.23%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%
Strongly Disagree	9	7.63%	8	9.09%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	**3.12**											
Median =	**3.00**											
Q.9. Funds for literacy should be targeted to libraries												
Strongly Agree	13	10.83%	9	10.23%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
Agree	53	44.17%	41	46.59%	5	38.46%	2	25.00%	2	50.00%	3	42.86%
No Opinion	35	29.17%	24	27.27%	2	15.38%	5	62.50%	2	50.00%	2	28.57%
Disagree	18	15.00%	13	14.77%	4	30.77%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.83%	1	1.14%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	**2.51**											
Median =	**2.00**											

Appendix C - Indiana LSTA Evaluation - Web Survey Summary

	All Library Response	All Library Percentages	Public Library Response	Public Library Percentages	School Library Response	School Library Percentages	Academic Library Response	Academic Library Percentages	Institutional Library Response	Institutional Library Percentages	Other Library Response	Other Library Percentages
Q.10. LSTA for INSPIRE has helped all types of libraries												
Strongly Agree	83	69.17%	57	64.77%	9	69.23%	8	100.00%	4	100.00%	5	71.43%
Agree	27	22.50%	23	26.14%	4	30.77%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No Opinion	8	6.67%	6	6.82%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	28.57%
Disagree	1	0.83%	1	1.14%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.83%	1	1.14%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	1.42											
Median =	1.00											
Q.11. LSTA grant process is too complicated												
Strongly Agree	3	2.63%	3	3.41%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Agree	26	22.81%	19	21.59%	5	38.46%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%
No Opinion	20	17.54%	14	15.91%	3	23.08%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Disagree	44	38.60%	35	39.77%	3	23.08%	2	25.00%	4	100.00%	0	0.00%
Strongly Disagree	21	18.42%	17	19.32%	2	15.38%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	3.47											
Median =	4.00											
Q.12. Reimbursement process is burdensome												
Strongly Agree	13	10.92%	8	9.09%	3	23.08%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%
Agree	39	32.77%	30	34.09%	6	46.15%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	1	16.67%
No Opinion	32	26.89%	19	21.59%	4	30.77%	3	37.50%	2	50.00%	4	66.67%
Disagree	32	26.89%	29	32.95%	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
Strongly Disagree	3	2.52%	2	2.27%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Mean =	2.77											
Median =	3.00											
Q.13. Evidence of partnering should be required for grants												
Strongly Agree	1	0.83%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Agree	13	10.83%	5	5.68%	2	15.38%	0	0.00%	4	100.00%	2	28.57%
No Opinion	18	15.00%	12	13.64%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	3	42.86%
Disagree	59	49.17%	48	54.55%	5	38.46%	5	62.50%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
Strongly Disagree	29	24.17%	23	26.14%	4	30.77%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
Mean =	3.85											
Median =	4.00											

Appendix C - Indiana LSTA Evaluation - Web Survey Summary

	All Library Response	All Library Percentages	Public Library Response	Public Library Percentages	School Library Response	School Library Percentages	Academic Library Response	Academic Library Percentages	Institutional Library Response	Institutional Library Percentages	Other Library Response	Other Library Percentages
Q.14. Reporting requirements discourage my library from applying												
Strongly Agree	3	2.50%	3	3.41%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Agree	10	8.33%	10	11.36%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
No Opinion	36	30.00%	25	28.41%	4	30.77%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	4	57.14%
Disagree	57	47.50%	40	45.45%	9	69.23%	2	25.00%	4	100.00%	2	28.57%
Strongly Disagree	14	11.67%	10	11.36%	0	0.00%	3	37.50%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
Mean =	**3.58**											
Median =	**4.00**											
Q.15. Acceptable travel time to technology training												
less than 30 minutes	4	3.39%	3	3.45%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
30 minutes - 60 minutes	56	47.46%	41	47.13%	6	46.15%	4	57.14%	0	0.00%	5	71.43%
1 hr. - 1 1/2 hours	39	33.05%	33	37.93%	4	30.77%	1	14.29%	0	0.00%	1	14.29%
1 1/2 hours - 2 hours	12	10.17%	8	9.20%	1	7.69%	2	28.57%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
more than 2 hours	7	5.93%	2	2.30%	2	15.38%	0	0.00%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%
Q.16. Acceptable travel time to non-technology training												
less than 30 minutes	9	7.89%	6	6.90%	1	8.33%	1	14.29%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%
30 minutes - 60 minutes	51	44.74%	42	48.28%	6	50.00%	2	28.57%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%
1 hr. - 1 1/2 hours	39	34.21%	31	35.63%	3	25.00%	1	14.29%	0	0.00%	4	66.67%
1 1/2 hours - 2 hours	12	10.53%	7	8.05%	0	0.00%	3	42.86%	1	50.00%	1	16.67%
more than 2 hours	3	2.63%	1	1.15%	2	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Q.17 Priorities												
(see accompanying text)												
Q.18. Type of library												
Public library	88	73.33%										
School library/media center	13	10.83%										
Academic library	8	6.67%										
Institutional library	4	3.33%										
Other	7	5.83%										

	All Library Response	All Library Percentages	Public Library Response	Public Library Percentages	School Library Response	School Library Percentages	Academic Library Response	Academic Library Percentages	Institutional Library Response	Institutional Library Percentages	Other Library Response	Other Library Percentages
Q.19. Library's staff size												
less than 1.00 FTE	6	5.04%	5	5.68%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%
1.00 FTE	9	7.56%	3	3.41%	5	38.46%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%
1.01 - 2.00 FTE	14	11.76%	8	9.09%	6	46.15%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2.01 - 3.00 FTE	5	4.20%	5	5.68%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3.01 - 5.00 FTE	9	7.56%	7	7.95%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
5.01 - 10.00 FTE	14	11.76%	12	13.64%	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
10.01 - 20.00 FTE	27	22.69%	24	27.27%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
more than 20.00 FTE	35	29.41%	24	27.27%	0	0.00%	4	50.00%	3	75.00%	4	66.67%
Q.20 Materials budget												
less than $ 1,000	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
$ 1,001 - $ 5,000	3	2.59%	1	1.18%	1	7.69%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%
$ 5,001 - $ 10,000	16	13.79%	8	9.41%	8	61.54%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
$ 10,001 - $ 20,000	14	12.07%	10	11.76%	2	15.38%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	33.33%
$ 20,001 - $ 35,000	9	7.76%	8	9.41%	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
$ 35,001 - $ 50,000	8	6.90%	7	8.24%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	0	0.00%
$ 50,001 - $ 75,000	5	4.31%	5	5.88%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
$ 75,001 - $ 100,000	10	8.62%	7	8.24%	2	15.38%	1	12.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
$ 100,001 - $ 250,000	22	18.97%	20	23.53%	0	0.00%	2	25.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
$ 250,001 - $ 500,000	12	10.34%	7	8.24%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	75.00%	2	33.33%
more than $ 500,000	17	14.66%	12	14.12%	0	0.00%	4	50.00%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%

Indiana Web Survey
Future Priorities and Comments

Priority 1

56k lines
Additional technology
Additional technology needs
Anything other than technology
Collection development
Connections for the Internet
Connectivity
Connectivity for the Internet
Digitization
Digitization
Digitization of archival materials
Digitization of archival materials (newspapers, etc.)
Digitization project
Digitization projects
Digitization projects
Digitization projects
Digitization projects that adhere to standards
Direct Internet connections
Direct Internet connections
Direct, reliable Internet connections
Distance learning
Distance learning
Distance learning capabilities
English as a 2nd language - literacy
Funding Internet access in libraries & media centers
Funding Internet access through IHETS
Funding projects to aid libraries to become compliant where feasible
Improving technology in smaller public libraries
Increase number of books on shelf
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE

INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE - & its development
INSPIRE - increase funding
INSPIRE project
INSPIRE support
INSPIRE support
Internet
Internet access
Internet access
Internet access
Internet access
Internet access
Internet access
Internet access
Internet connection
Internet connection
Internet connection funding
Internet connection support - we couldn't afford it without
Internet connections
Internet connectivity
Internet connectivity
Internet connectivity
Internet connectivity
Internet connectivity
Internet connectivity
Internet service
Internet T1 connectivity
Maintaining current/introducing new technologies
Networking Indiana Public Libraries
Preservation
Retrospective conversion
Scanning of Indiana historical material
Statewide projects like INSPIRE
State-wide resources
Technology
Technology
Technology
Technology
Technology

Technology
Technology
Technology
Technology maintenance and tech support
Telecommunications to Internet
Training
Training for the public
Web content development
Web site fees
Wireless computers

Priority 2

Archiving government information info (print and electronic)
Assistance with automation system support costs
Automation expenses
Automation of other libraries in corporation
Building/Equipment
Computer updates
Consortiums
Continuation & development of Wheels
Continue retrospective conversions
Continued support for Internet access and other technology funding
Creation of Indiana historical databases
Database availability
Digitization
Digitization
Digitization
Digitization
Digitization of local history materials
Direct Internet connections
Distance learning
Distance learning
Distance Learning
For the state library to decide what goal they wish for all libraries
Funding INSPIRE
Getting teachers to use INSPIRE
Hardware
INCOLSA support
INCOLSA support
Indexing/digitization of local data, like cemetery & death indexes
Individual technology grants
Innovations improving service
Innovative projects
Innovative technology

Innovative ideas
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE
INSPIRE

General Comments

Doing a great job!! Keep up the good work!!

I am interested in any & all grants for our library. We are now housed in two rooms...

I appreciate that the grant process is not too difficult

I appreciate the grant.

I think there is a burden especially on small and medium-sized libraries to delay projects of significance because the date must begin after the LSTA has been granted. Most technology vendors offer year end incentives to purchase their hardware that we miss

I think there is a burden especially on small libraries

I understand the concept/need for "reimbursement" but it makes things difficult

It is helpful to have employees whose salaries are funded by LSTA monies at the Indiana

State Library and INCOLSA to help with questions about LSTA grants & applications.

Time for my library is maximized with their help and this makes it possible to apply for LSTA funds

LSTA & its predecessor fund have made real contribution to my library's ability. It has been very important to community.

LSTA grant funds are an absolute asset to our organization. We have been able to greatly improve our technology infrastructure and position ourselves to vastly improve service to our patrons.

Martha Roblee was very helpful in our request for more time to complete our project

Partnerships with other libraries, if possible, are a great idea. With the instability of storage formats, I am not sure that digitization is better than microfilm

State library does an excellent job of administering the LSTA grants. We would not be able to offer automation, Internet, etc. services to our patrons without its help. Thanks!!

The Indiana State Library has worked very hard to make the LSTA application as simple as possible. My one criticism is the requirement for partnerships. These are often very hard to establish and maintain.

The library consortium grant between the Shoals Community School Corporation and the Shoals Public Library will eventually result in an online catalog of materials available in both the public library and the school libraries.

The State of Indiana lags behind other states

We need better reporting from grant recipients on how money is spent

We need more grant opportunities similar to those administered by the Illinois Secretary of State and the Illinois State Library

While technology is important, we also need to work on preserving the artifacts we already have. Archiving of government documents in print and electronic formats is extremely important!

Without LSTA, our library would not be a real library

Work toward making connections between school and public libraries. Promote circulation systems that connect both kinds of libraries thus making collections available to all populations in a city or district. Fund more literacy programs.